

the brave fight for freedom constantly being waged against Moscow by the people of the Ukraine. This region, which is essentially non-Russian and is the largest, most resourceful of those states incorporated into the Soviet Union, recognized yesterday the 39th anniversary of its independence from the Russian czars. And, though in 1920 the Ukrainian people were robbed of this independence by Communist Russia, their lamp of freedom has since continued to burn. In view of the Hungarian revolt and other hopeful symptoms of a breakdown in Moscow's influence, it is my feeling that we should continue to encourage also these Ukrainian lovers of freedom in their own indictment and defiance of Communist imperialism.

### Ukrainian Independence Day

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. B. W. (PAT) KEARNEY**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1957

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, January 22, the 39th anniversary of the Independence of the Ukraine, marks still another milestone in the grim history of the resistance waged by freedom-loving people against the oppressive force of Soviet Russia.

In recognition of the spirit of rebellion against Communist tyranny now sweeping the world, it is fitting that we express our sympathy with the 40 million of Ukrainians who have refused to forget that they are a nation although national independence was wrested from their land 37 years ago by the invading armies of the Soviet Union.

During the long years since, the struggles of the Ukrainians have been unrelenting, and have made them a source of internal peril to the Soviet empire. Their undermining efforts have never ceased, and most recently, Ukrainian officers and men in the Red army gave aid to the Hungarian patriots in their heroic stand.

On this 39th anniversary of their national independence, we extend to the

people of the Ukrainian Nation our sincere hope that the coming year may see their moral and political heritage restored to them.

### Ten Thousand Orphans for the United States

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. CHARLES O. PORTER**

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1957

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill today on behalf of several thousand war orphans and American families who seek their admission to the United States.

Such legislation would reestablish, within the State Department, an orphan program quite similar to the provisions of the orphan section of the Refugee Relief Act. My bill provides for a quota of 10,000 special nonquota immigrant visas to be issued to eligible orphans until such time as the quota is exhausted. My bill also increases the age of eligible orphans from 10 years as provided in the Refugee Relief Act to 12 years.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to read into the RECORD one of the typical letters of the heavy number being received by my office each day on this matter. This letter is written by Mr. and Mrs. Leslie E. Wilson of Medford, Oreg., and states as follows:

DEAR MR. PORTER: We are writing to ask your help and support in the extension of the Refugee Act of 1953.

We are fairly young and have planned our lives so that now we live more than comfortably, on investments we have made during the 10 years of our marriage. There is a need in every home for a child. Although we have everything, materially and spiritually, a couple could need or desire, we do lack the greatest joy of all, a child of our own to raise and to love.

We understand that throughout our country, social workers and welfare organizations are fighting adoption by proxy and the allowing of more orphans to enter the United States. For the past 3 years, we have tried to adopt a child here in America.

Mrs. Wilson was a social worker in Oregon for a little over 6 years and neither of us approve the procedures set down by the social services in Oregon or many of the other States and agencies we have contacted. One of our objections is that we do not feel psychoanalysis should be the primary basis for judging a couple's suitability to raise an adoptive child. Our youth, whether speaking of America or foreign youth, is the future of our world of tomorrow. If American families can give love and security to foreign children, they should be allowed to enter this country.

It indeed seems a shame that the work of Harry Holt, of Creswell, should be stopped. He has brought joy and hope to many couples and has much work yet to be done. The Hungarian situation has focused attention on the immigration question and we feel that youth should have a priority to enter our country.

Do fight for and obtain passage of an extension of the Refugee Act of 1953 that will allow the continued adoption by proxy.

Thank you, and with our best wishes, we remain.

Sincerely yours,

Mr. and Mrs. LESLIE WILSON.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to note that Mr. and Mrs. Harry Holt, of Creswell, Oreg., have initiated, and personally undertaken, with the effective support of Senator NEUBERGER, the herculean task of bringing many Korean children to America. This unselfish act has been at great personal expense to Mr. Holt and cannot, of course, answer the many requests made of him.

Mr. Speaker, the other important section of my bill would grant permanent residence in the United States for those orphans admitted under the emergency parole procedures, and these adopted orphans would thus be on the same basis as if they had been issued immigrant visas.

I should like to emphasize that the orphan problem is not solely concerned with Japan and Korea, but that the problem is also urgent in the Middle East, Greece, Italy, and other countries.

Mr. Speaker, it is fitting to note that in the enrichment of human life lies a part of America's greatness, based not upon our size, our strength, our wealth, but upon our belief in liberty and our deep passion for the rights of man.

I firmly believe passage of this bill is a step in which the world can appreciate our sincere interest in helping the oppressed.

## SENATE

FRIDAY, JANUARY 25, 1957

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, God, bowing for a halcyon moment at this shrine of Thy grace, we acknowledge before Thee that our lives are so often as restless pools. We are disturbed by the social turmoil of our times, burdened by many anxieties, tempted to cynicism by human cruelty and perversity, often disheartened by human folly which seems to profit so little by bitter reaping. We would lay our problems and tasks before Thee, not to escape them, but praying for Thy em-

powering, so that with strength and courage we may carry them with a new gallantry. In a divided and violent world, may we be among those whom the generations to come shall call blessed because even when rampant evil compels us to unsheath a clean sword our record will write our names among today's makers of a just peace. We ask it in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, January 23, 1957, was approved, and its reading was dispensed with.

### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF JOINT RESOLUTIONS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following joint resolutions:

On January 11, 1957:

S. J. Res. 1. Joint resolution making Inauguration Day a legal holiday in the metropolitan area of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

On January 18, 1957:

S. J. Res. 2. Joint resolution to extend the time for transmitting the Economic Report of the President for the first regular session of the 85th Congress.

## EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, and I invite the attention of the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] to this motion.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

## EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

Messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, and withdrawing the nomination of William Kelley, of Florida, for promotion in the Foreign Service, which nominating messages were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

## EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. GREEN, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Raymond A. Hare, of West Virginia, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Egypt;

Douglas MacArthur 2d, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Japan;

Carl W. Strom, of Iowa, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Kingdom of Cambodia; and

James David Zellerbach, of California, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Italy.

C. Tyler Wood, of the District of Columbia, to be Assistant to the Director of the International Cooperation Administration for Evaluation in the Department of State.

Howard S. Cullman, of New York, to be United States Commissioner General, Brussels Universal and International Exhibition, 1958.

The following-named persons to be members of the United States Advisory Commission on Information for terms of 3 years expiring January 27, 1959:

Mark A. May, of Connecticut.

Lewis W. Douglas, of Arizona.

Sigurd S. Larmon, of New York, to be a member of the United States Advisory Commission on Information.

William L. Kilcoin, of the District of Columbia, and sundry other persons for appointment and promotion in the Foreign Service; and

Gordon H. Mattison, of Ohio, and sundry other persons for appointment and promotion in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nomination on the Executive Calendar.

## DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Ellsworth Bunker, of Vermont, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to India, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Nepal.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, Mr. Ellsworth Bunker has lived near my home in Vermont for many years. As a member of the community, he has been a good neighbor. As Ambassador to India, he should well maintain the position of the United States as a good neighbor in the community of nations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

The nomination was confirmed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nomination.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

## LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

## AUTHORIZATION TO COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION TO SUBMIT REPORTS DURING ADJOURNMENT OF THE SENATE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules and Administration be permitted to report bills and resolutions during the adjournment of the Senate. The committee is to meet on Monday, and it desires authority to report bills and resolutions during the adjournment of the Senate, in order that they may be placed on the calendar.

Mr. ELLENDER. Are the bills and resolutions to which the Senator refers money measures?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. They will lie over.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Yes. However, the committee desires authority to report them on Monday, when the Senate will not be in session.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

## TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be the usual morning hour, for the presentation of petitions and memorials, the introduction of bills and joint resolutions, the submission of other resolutions, and the transaction of other routine business, subject to the customary 2-minute limitation on statements.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

## REPORT OF FEDERAL EXTENSION SERVICE

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law,

a report of the Federal Extension Service, Department of Agriculture, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

## CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN REAL PROPERTY TO UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize and direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey to the University of Missouri, for agricultural purposes, certain real property in Callaway County, Mo. (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

## REPORT ON OFFICERS ASSIGNED TO PERMANENT DUTY IN THE AIR FORCE AT THE SEAT OF GOVERNMENT

A letter from the Director, Legislative Liaison, Department of the Air Force, Washington, D. C., reporting, pursuant to law, that, as of December 31, 1956, there was an aggregate of 2,772 officers assigned or detailed to permanent duty in the executive element of the Air Force at the seat of government; to the Committee on Armed Services.

## REPORT ON PROGRESS OF FLIGHT TRAINING PROGRAM

A letter from the Director, Legislative Liaison, Department of the Air Force, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the progress of the flight training program (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

## REPORT OF RENEGOTIATION BOARD

A letter from the Chairman, The Renegotiation Board, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Board, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

## REPORT ON FOREIGN SERVICE RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY FUND

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report showing the condition of the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability Fund, for the fiscal years ended June 30, 1955 and 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

## MANAGEMENT OF RED LAKE INDIAN FOREST AND SAWMILL

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation relating to the management of the Red Lake Indian Forest and Sawmill (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

## PRIORITIES IN TRANSPORTATION BY MERCHANT VESSELS

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for standby authority for priorities in transportation by merchant vessels in the interest of national defense, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

## AMENDMENT OF SECTION 633, TITLE 28, UNITED STATES CODE, RELATING TO FEES OF UNITED STATES COMMISSIONERS

A letter from the Acting Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, Washington, D. C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 633 of title 28, United States Code, prescribing fees of United States commissioners (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## AMENDMENT OF SECTION 1716, TITLE 18, UNITED STATES CODE

A letter from the Deputy Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 1716 of Title 18, United States Code, so as to conform to the act of July 14, 1956 (70 Stat. 538-540) (with



an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### ADMISSION OF DISPLACED PERSONS— WITHDRAWAL OF NAME

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, withdrawing the name of Hunfy D. Lee from a report transmitted to the Senate on July 1, 1956, pursuant to section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, with a view to the adjustment of his immigration status; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### AMENDMENT OF SECTION 645, TITLE 14, UNITED STATES CODE, RELATING TO SETTLEMENT OF CERTAIN CLAIMS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 645 of title 14, United States Code, relating to the settlement of claims incident to activities of the Coast Guard, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### RESTORATION OF CERTAIN AUTHORITY OF THE POSTMASTER GENERAL

A letter from the Deputy Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to restore the authority of the Postmaster General to adjust postage rates for airmail weighing in excess of 8 ounces, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

#### DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. CARLSON members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

#### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution of the House of Delegates of the State of Maryland; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

##### "House Resolution 4

"House resolution urging the Congress of the United States to adopt Good Friday as a legal national holiday

"Whereas America is a Christian nation; and

"Whereas all Christian religions recognize Jesus Christ as the Son of God and this Nation has created a national holiday to commemorate the birth of Christ; and

"Whereas the decease and departure from this earth by the Son of God is of equal significance with His birth; and

"Whereas the State of Maryland recognizes Good Friday as a legal holiday: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the House of Delegates of the State of Maryland urges the Congress of the United States to adopt Good Friday as a legal national holiday; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be spread upon the journal of the house of delegates and that the secretary of state be directed to send a copy of this resolution under the great seal of Maryland to the Members of the Maryland delegation to the Congress of the United States, the President

of the Senate of the United States and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States

"By the house of delegates, January 9, 1957.

"Rules suspended and adopted.

"By order, Elizabeth M. Reese, assistant chief clerk.

"JOHN C. LUBER,

"Speaker of the House of Delegates.

"GEORGE W. OWINGS, Jr.,

"Chief Clerk of the House of Delegates."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of New Hampshire; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Whereas the Altar of the Nation, located at the Cathedral of the Pines, in Rindge, N. H., which has been dedicated to the glory of God of all American war dead and which, in fact, has been recognized as an interdenominational shrine by Americans everywhere; and

"Whereas the Congress of the United States has previously declared a national policy to preserve objects of national significance for the inspiration and benefit of the people of the United States; and

"Whereas it is the sense of the General Court of the State of New Hampshire that steps be taken to recognize the national sentiment already expressed by dedicating this memorial as a national shrine: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the General Court of the State of New Hampshire memorializes the Congress of the United States and the appropriate officials of the administration in Washington to take whatever steps may be necessary and proper to give this shrine its national recognition, upon the provision, however, that nothing herein shall be held or understood to deprive the State of New Hampshire of its jurisdiction in and over said site or the conveyance of title therein to the Federal Government; be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Secretary of State, to the Representatives and Senators of this State in Washington, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate of the Congress of the United States, and to such other officials in the United States Government as may request the same.

"Passed January 17, 1957.

"Attest:

"ROBERT L. STARK,

"Deputy Secretary of State."

#### CHAPLAINS' DAY—RESOLUTION

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, a resolution adopted by the Charlevoix, Pa., Aerie, Fraternal Order of Eagles, on January 21, 1957, relating to the designation of the first Sunday in February of each year as Chaplains' Day. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

##### CHAPLAINS' DAY RESOLUTION

Whereas on February 3, 1943, the U. S. S. *Dorchester* was sunk in the North Atlantic, during World War II, with the loss of more than 600 American lives, including 4 chaplains of 3 great religious faiths: George L. Fox, Protestant; John P. Washington, Catholic; Alexander L. Goode, Jewish rabbi; and Clark V. Poling, Protestant minister; and

Whereas these four chaplains gave up their lives that others might live, going down together on the deck of the U. S. S. *Dorchester*, to give to the world for all time a dramatic example of human brotherhood, courage, and selflessness, and an inspiring demonstration of interfaith unity and understanding; and

Whereas in order that the meaning and significance of their heroic deed may be perpetuated each year, memorializing not only the supreme sacrifice of the four chaplains, but the supreme sacrifice of all chaplains who gave up their lives for others, inspiring all Americans by their example of faith and courage: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we urge the Congress of the United States to set aside the 1st Sunday in February each year, as Chaplains' Day, and that the day be devoted to the dedicated memory of the four chaplains of the U. S. S. *Dorchester* and all chaplains who gave their lives for our country.

#### RESOLUTION OF MILWAUKEE JUNIOR BAR ASSOCIATION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I was pleased to receive from Thomas N. Tuttle, president of the Milwaukee Junior Bar Association, information concerning a resolution adopted by that fine organization urging the passage of what has come to be known as the Jenkins-Keogh legislation.

This proposed legislation, whose principle, in my judgment, is eminently sound, would permit self-employed individuals to build up what amounts to a financial nest egg for their later retirement years, by being relieved of the heaviest rates of taxation during their earlier years of relatively higher earnings.

The Jenkins-Keogh bill, as I have previously indicated by comments on the Senate floor, has received wide approval in principle from the White House down.

Of course, the inevitable problem has arisen as to its cost to the Treasury in terms of reduced revenue intake.

It is, however, the hope, I believe, of thinking citizens throughout the Nation—particularly members of the great legal profession—that the day will soon come when America's revenue situation will permit adoption of the principle of this proposed legislation.

I believe that Representative JENKINS and Representative KEOGH are to be congratulated for their continued effort down through the years on behalf of this legislative objective.

This is the sort of proposal which should, in my judgment, receive consideration from the Federal Commission on Taxation, which I have proposed be set up under my bill, S. 769.

I present Mr. Tuttle's letter and ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD, and be thereafter appropriately referred to the Senate Finance Committee.

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MILWAUKEE JUNIOR BAR ASSOCIATION,

Milwaukee, Wis., January 21, 1957.

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,

Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: On January 7, 1957, the Milwaukee Junior Bar Association adopted a resolution urging the passage of the so-called Jenkins-Keogh bill, which would grant to self-employed individuals Federal income-tax benefits comparable to those currently enjoyed by employees of corporations under qualified pension and profit-sharing plans.

We respectfully request that you do whatever you can to secure the passage of this much-needed legislation.

Very truly yours,

THOMAS N. TUTTLE,  
President.

#### DEVELOPMENT OF TUTTLE CREEK DAM—LETTER

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I have just received a letter from the manager of the Manhattan (Kans.) Chamber of Commerce stating that the directors of the chamber of commerce had adopted a resolution approving a conservation pool for the Tuttle Creek Reservoir, now under construction.

I ask unanimous consent that this letter be printed in the RECORD and referred to the appropriate committee.

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MANHATTAN CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,  
Manhattan Kans., January 21, 1957.  
Senator FRANK CARLSON,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CARLSON: On December 18, 1956, the board of directors of the Manhattan Chamber of Commerce unanimously passed a resolution requesting that action be taken to encourage the development of Tuttle Creek Dam with a conservation pool.

The board believes that the conservation of water is as vital as flood control in the conservation of natural resources and, therefore, requests that appropriate action be taken to authorize Tuttle Creek Dam to be completed and operated as a conservation-pool project.

Very truly yours,

LUD C. FISHER, Manager.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. HENNINGS, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, without amendment:

S. Con. Res. 2. Concurrent resolution to create a joint congressional committee to make a full and complete study and investigation of all matters connected with the election, succession, and duties of the President and Vice President (Rept. No. 14);

S. Res. 20. Resolution to authorize one temporary additional clerk for the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service; and

S. Res. 35. Resolution extending to June 30, 1957, the authority of the Special Committee To Study the Foreign Aid Program, and providing additional funds (Rept. No. 17).

By Mr. HENNINGS, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with an amendment:

S. Res. 25. Resolution to investigate the administration of the civil-service system and the Post Office Department (Rept. No. 15);

S. Res. 48. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Armed Services to investigate certain matters relating to the common defense (Rept. No. 16);

S. Res. 52. Resolution authorizing an investigation of juvenile delinquency in the United States (Rept. No. 26); and

S. Res. 56. Resolution authorizing an investigation of national penitentiaries (Rept. No. 28).

By Mr. HENNINGS, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with amendments:

S. Con. Res. 6. Concurrent resolution providing for the printing with illustrations and binding of proceedings in connection with the acceptance of the statue of the late Chief Justice Edward Douglass White (Rept. No. 18);

S. Res. 37. Resolution providing for additional temporary assistants and funds for the Committee on Government Operations (Rept. No. 19);

S. Res. 42. Resolution authorizing the Select Committee on Small Business to investigate problems of American small and independent business (Rept. No. 20);

S. Res. 44. Resolution further authorizing the Committee on Banking and Currency to make a study of public and private housing, and providing additional funds therefor (Rept. No. 21);

S. Res. 49. Resolution authorizing an investigation of matters pertaining to constitutional rights (Rept. No. 23);

S. Res. 50. Resolution authorizing an investigation of the administration of the Trading With the Enemy and War Claims Acts (Rept. No. 24);

S. Res. 51. Resolution authorizing an investigation of immigration and naturalization matters (Rept. No. 25);

S. Res. 53. Resolution authorizing an investigation of problems pertaining to certain European and Asiatic countries (Rept. No. 26);

S. Res. 54. Resolution authorizing a study of matters pertaining to the strengthening of the Federal Criminal Code (Rept. No. 29);

S. Res. 55. Resolution to examine the administration of the Patent Office and statutes relating to patents, copyrights, and trademarks (Rept. No. 30);

S. Res. 57. Resolution authorizing an investigation of antitrust and antimonopoly laws and their administration (Rept. No. 31); and

S. Res. 58. Resolution authorizing an investigation of the administration of the national security law and matters relating to espionage (Rept. No. 32).

#### COMPENSATION OF EMPLOYEES OF FORMER SENATOR THOMAS A. WOFFORD (S. REPT. NO. 13)

Mr. HENNINGS, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 65), and submitted a report thereon, which resolution was placed on the calendar, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Secretary of the Senate is authorized and directed to pay, out of the contingent fund of the Senate, to the administrative and clerical assistants appointed by former Senator Thomas A. Wofford, of South Carolina, who were carried on the Senate payroll on November 6, 1956, salary for services in his office for the period November 7, 1956, through December 6, 1956, or for so much of that time through December 6, 1956, as they were not otherwise gainfully employed, at their respective rates of salary as of November 6, 1956.

#### MRS. JANE BROWN

Mr. HENNINGS, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 66), which was placed on the calendar, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Mrs. Jane Brown, sister of Thomas M. Greenwood, an employee of the Senate at the time of his death, a sum equal to 2 months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

#### COMPENSATION OF EMPLOYEES OF FORMER SENATOR ROBERT HUMPHREYS

Mr. HENNINGS, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 67), which was placed on the calendar, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Secretary of the Senate is authorized and directed to pay, out of the contingent fund of the Senate, to the administrative and clerical assistants appointed by former Senator Robert Humphreys, of Kentucky, who were carried on the Senate payroll on November 6, 1956, salary for services in his office for the period November 7, 1956, through December 6, 1956, or for so much of that time through December 6, 1956, as they were not otherwise gainfully employed, at their respective rates of salary as of November 6, 1956.

#### PATRICIA M. CLEMENTS AND MARY VIRGINIA MITCHELL

Mr. HENNINGS, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 68), which was placed on the calendar, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Patricia M. Clements and Mary Virginia Mitchell, daughters of Hal Mitchell, an employee of the Senate at the time of his death, a sum to each equal to 2 months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

#### MARY MARGARET HARTIGAN

Mr. HENNINGS, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 69), which was placed on the calendar, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Mary Margaret Hartigan, widow of James S. Hartigan, an employee of the Senate at the time of his death, a sum equal to 11 months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

#### COMPENSATION OF EMPLOYEES OF FORMER SENATOR WILLIAM R. LAIRD, III

Mr. HENNINGS, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 70), which was placed on the calendar, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Secretary of the Senate is authorized and directed to pay, out of the contingent fund of the Senate, to the administrative and clerical assistants appointed by former Senator William R. Laird, III, of West Virginia, who were carried on the Senate payroll on November 6, 1956, salary for services in his office for the period November 7, 1956, through December 6, 1956, or for so much of that time through December 6, 1956, as they were not otherwise gainfully employed, at their respective rates of salary as of November 6, 1956.

#### REVISION AND PRINTING OF SENATE MANUAL

Mr. HENNINGS, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported



an original resolution (S. Res. 71), which was placed on the calendar, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Rules and Administration be, and it is hereby, directed to prepare a revised edition of the Senate Rules and Manual for the use of the 85th Congress, that said Rules and Manual shall be printed as a Senate document, and that 1,500 additional copies shall be printed and bound, of which 1,000 copies shall be for the Senate, 100 copies shall be for the use of the Committee on Rules and Administration, and the remaining 400 copies shall be bound in full morocco and tagged as to contents and delivered as may be directed by the committee.

#### PROVISION FOR MEMBERS ON THE PART OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING AND JOINT COMMITTEE OF CONGRESS ON THE LIBRARY

Mr. HENNINGS, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 72), which was placed on the calendar, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the following joint committees of Congress:

Joint Committee on Printing: Mr. Hayden, of Arizona; Mr. Hennings, of Missouri; and Mr. Javits, of New York.

Joint Committee of Congress on the Library: Mr. Green, of Rhode Island; Mr. Hennings, of Missouri; Mr. Talmadge, of Georgia; Mr. Curtis, of Nebraska; and Mr. Cooper, of Kentucky.

#### AMENDMENT OF SMALL-BUSINESS ACT OF 1953, RELATING TO INCREASED AMOUNT AVAILABLE FOR BUSINESS LOANS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, I report favorably without amendment, the bill (S. 637) to increase the business-loan authorization of the Small Business Administration under the Small Business Act of 1953, as amended, and I submit a report—No. 12—thereon.

The bill authorizes an additional \$65 million for the business-loan fund of the Small Business Administration. The existing authorization of \$150 million, which has been outstanding since 1953, will be fully committed within the next few weeks. The passage of this bill is necessary to permit the continuation of business-loan operations, and I am hopeful that S. 637 can be scheduled for early consideration by the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

The bill (S. 637) to amend the Small-Business Act of 1953 to increase the amount available thereunder for business loans, was placed on the calendar.

#### INVESTIGATION OF CERTAIN PROBLEMS RELATING TO INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I report favorably with an amendment, Senate Resolution 26,

authorizing the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to investigate certain problems relating to interstate and foreign commerce. This resolution was unanimously approved at a meeting of the committee yesterday. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the resolution will be so referred.

#### BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. IVES, and Mr. PURTELL):

S. 814. A bill to establish standards for hours of work and overtime pay of laborers and mechanics employed on work done under contract for, or with the financial aid of, the United States, for any Territory, or for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. SMITH of New Jersey when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself and Mr. IVES):

S. 815. A bill to provide for assistance to States in their efforts to promote, establish, and maintain safe workplaces and practices in industry, thereby reducing human suffering and financial loss and increasing production through safeguarding available manpower; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. SMITH of New Jersey when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. IVES, Mr. SALTONSTALL, and Mr. PURTELL):

S. 816. A bill to amend the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, approved September 17, 1916, as amended, by providing for reimbursement of expenditures from the Employees' Compensation Fund by Federal employing agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. SMITH of New Jersey when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. IVES, and Mr. PURTELL):

S. 817. A bill to prohibit discrimination on account of sex in the payment of wages by employers having employees engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce, and to provide procedures for assisting employees in collecting wages lost by reason of any such discrimination; and

S. 818. A bill to provide for the payment of expenses of administration of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act by insurance carriers and self-insurers authorized to insure under section 32 of the act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. SMITH of New Jersey when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 819. A bill for the relief of Mary A. Ford; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FREAR:

S. 820. A bill for the relief of Constantinos Platounaris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCOTT:

S. 821. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act with respect to annuities of

Panama Canal ship pilots; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. SCOTT when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania:

S. 822. A bill to exempt from Federal income tax dividends paid by regulated investment companies whose income is 95 percent derived from tax-exempt Government obligations and 5 percent from Federal Government taxable obligations; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 823. A bill for the relief of Maud Abraham; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POTTER:

S. 824. A bill to encourage the improvement and development of marketing facilities for handling perishable agricultural commodities; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 825. A bill to permit the construction of certain public works on the Great Lakes for flood control, and for protection from high-water levels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY):

S. 826. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Cape Cod Canal National Park, in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 827. A bill for the relief of Guillermo B. Riganon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGER (for himself, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. MORSE, Mr. McNAMARA, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. NEELY, and Mr. MANSFIELD):

S. 828. A bill authorizing certain inspections and investigations in metallic and non-metallic mines and quarries; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 829. A bill to provide for corn-base acreages and other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 830. A bill to provide for the conveyance of Hines Service Center, Hines, Ill., and Lincoln Ordnance Plant, Springfield, Ill., to the State of Illinois; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 831. A bill to encourage the establishment of voluntary pension plans by individuals; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. DIRKSEN when he introduced the first above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DIRKSEN (by request):

S. 832. A bill for the relief of Matilda Strah; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. IVES:

S. 833. A bill for the relief of Vida Letitia Baker;

S. 834. A bill for the relief of David Ajuelo, Roza Ajuelo, Victoria Ajuelo, and Lizet Ajuelo; and

S. 835. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to consider and render judgment on the claim of the Cuban-American Sugar Co. against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. IVES (for himself, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. CASE of New Jersey):

S. 836. A bill to make certain changes in the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. IVES when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CLARK (for himself, Mr. McNAMARA, and Mr. MURRAY):

S. 837. A bill to amend section 9 (c) (3) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. CLARK when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

S. 838. A bill to establish in the Executive Office of the President a National Freedom Board which shall direct the activities of the United States in promoting the cause of freedom; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine:

S. 839. A bill to provide a method for regulating and fixing wage rates for employees of navy yards; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. NEUBERGER, and Mr. SPARKMAN):

S. 840. A bill providing for price reporting and research with respect to forest products; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. STENNIS:

S. 841. A bill to provide for establishing a price-reporting service for basic forest products; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 842. A bill to require the Secretary of the Army to issue to the Joe Graham Post No. 119, American Legion, a deed to certain lands within the Ship Island Military Reservation, removing certain conditions heretofore made a part of the conveyance thereof, and providing for the conveyance of a portion of such lands to the United Daughters of the Confederacy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the remarks of Mr. STENNIS when he introduced the first above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

S. 843. A bill further amending the Securities Act of 1933; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. SPARKMAN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 844. A bill to provide a program of national health insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. MURRAY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MURRAY (for himself and Mr. MANSFIELD):

S. 845. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force to make grants to certain educational institutions for the construction of military and naval science buildings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ANDERSON (for himself, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. CARROLL, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. KUCHEL, and Mr. ALLOTT):

S. 846. A bill for the establishment of a National Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission to study the outdoor recreation resources of the public lands and other land and water areas of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. ANDERSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MURRAY (for himself and Mr. MANSFIELD):

S. 847. A bill to amend the act of June 5, 1944, relating to the construction, operation, and maintenance of Hungry Horse Dam, Mont.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. NEUBERGER (for himself and Mr. MORSE):

S. 848. A bill to incorporate the Veterans of World War I of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 849. A bill for the relief of Sydney Douglas Catchpole; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PURTELL:

S. 850. A bill for the relief of Stavros Manousos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 851. A bill for the relief of Marek Fluss Vozcka; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

S. 852. A bill for the relief of Hilda Viola Young; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MANSFIELD (for himself and Mr. MURRAY):

S. 853. A bill for the relief of Fethi Hepcaci; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONG (for himself and Mr. ELLENDER):

S. 854. A bill to provide for the improvement of Bayou Lafourche, La., and construction of the Lafourche-Jump Waterway; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. McNAMARA:

S. 855. A bill to amend section 203 (j) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to permit the distribution of surplus property to municipal governments for municipal governmental purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. McNAMARA (for himself, Mr. MURRAY, and Mr. CLARK):

S. 856. A bill to repeal section 9 (h) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, relating to non-Communist affidavits;

S. 857. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act in order to permit supervisors to be considered as employees under the provisions of such act, and for other purposes;

S. 858. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act, as amended; and

S. 859. A bill to amend section 14 (b) of the National Labor Relations Act so as to protect the rights of employees and employers, in industries affecting commerce, to enter into union-shop agreements; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. McNAMARA when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ALLOTT:

S. 860. A bill to authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to grant relief with respect to claims arising out of deliveries of eligible surplus feed grains on ineligible dates in connection with purchase orders under its emergency feed programs; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 861. A bill for the relief of Ernest Hagler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. ALLOTT when he introduced the first above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ALLOTT (for himself and Mr. CARROLL):

S. 862. A bill for the relief of Barbara L. Weiss; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARRETT (for himself, Mr. MALONE, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. LANGER, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, and Mr. YOUNG):

S. 863. A bill to affirm and recognize the water laws of the States lying wholly or partly west of the 98th meridian; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. THYE:

S. 864. A bill to provide for the transfer of certain lands to the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. COOPER (for himself and Mr. MORTON):

S. 865. A bill to provide for Federal financial assistance to the States and Territories in the construction of public elementary and secondary school facilities; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. COOPER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. NEUBERGER (for himself and Mr. MORSE):

S. 866. A bill authorizing the issuance of not to exceed 10,000 special nonquota immigrant visas to eligible orphans; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. NEUBERGER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 867. A bill to provide for assistance to and cooperation with States in strengthening and improving State and local programs for the diminution, control, and treatment of juvenile delinquency; to the Committee of Labor and Public Welfare;

S. 868. A bill to provide a 30-percent credit against the Federal individual income tax for amounts paid as tuition or fees to certain public and private institutions of higher education; to the Committee on Finance;

S. 869. A bill to establish a program of scholarship aid and long-term loans to students in higher education and to provide facilities assistance to institutions of higher education;

S. 870. A bill to authorize Federal payments to the States to assist in constructing schools;

S. 871. A bill to study the use of conservation programs to provide healthful outdoor training for young men and to establish a pilot Youth Conservation Corps; and

S. 872. A bill to provide school-construction assistance to the States; to establish a program of scholarship aid and long-term loans to students in higher education; to provide facilities assistance to institutions of higher education; to provide a 30-percent credit against the Federal individual income tax for amounts paid as tuition or fees to certain public and private institutions of higher education; to provide for assistance to and cooperation with States in strengthening and improving State and local programs for the diminution, control, and treatment of juvenile delinquency; to study the use of conservation programs to provide healthful outdoor training for young men; to establish a pilot Youth Conservation Corps; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. COOPER:

S. 873. A bill for the relief of Shu Yen Lin, his wife, Shau Ying Lin, and children, Hang Shan Lin, Gee Chek Lin, Gee Ming Lin, and Chi Fong Lin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WATKINS:

S. 874. A bill for the relief of Cornelius Vander Hoek;

S. 875. A bill for the relief of Vuokko A. Bingham;

S. 876. A bill for the relief of Katharina Theresia Beuving Keyzer;

S. 877. A bill for the relief of Donworth V. Gubler;

S. 878. A bill for the relief of Cecyle D. Smack;

S. 879. A bill for the relief of Anna Adora Jensen;

S. 880. A bill for the relief of Necmettin Cengiz;

S. 881. A bill for the relief of Norine Vicenti;

S. 882. A bill for the relief of Pauline Ethel Angus; and



S. 883. A bill to extend for 1 year the time for filing of claims by former prisoners of war under section 6 (e) of the War Claims Act of 1948; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 884. A bill for the relief of Ray Wilkinson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 885. A bill to establish a deferred grazing program and a protein feed program as parts of the relief available to drought-stricken areas under Public Law 875, 81st Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 886. A bill to provide transportation on Canadian vessels between ports in southeastern Alaska, and between Hyder, Alaska, and other points in southeastern Alaska or the continental United States, either directly or via a foreign port, or for any part of the transportation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ANDERSON (for himself, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. BLAKLEY):

S. J. Res. 39. Joint resolution to authorize the construction of certain water conservation projects to provide for a more adequate supply of water for irrigation purposes in the Pecos River Basin, New Mexico and Texas; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JENNER:

S. J. Res. 40. Joint resolution providing for the revision of the Status of Forces Agreement and certain other treaties and international agreements, or the withdrawal of the United States from such treaties and agreements, so that foreign countries will not have criminal jurisdiction over American Armed Forces personnel stationed within their boundaries; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. WATKINS:

S. J. Res. 41. Joint resolution declaring September 17 a legal public holiday to be known as Constitution Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

S. J. Res. 42. Joint resolution to promote peace and stability in the Middle East; to the Committees on Foreign Relations and Armed Services, jointly.

(See the remarks of Mr. MORSE when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

## PROPOSED LEGISLATION TO IMPLEMENT THE PRESIDENT'S LABOR PROGRAM

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, five bills which are a part of President Eisenhower's labor program.

These bills are as follows:

One. A bill to establish standards for hours of work and overtime pay of laborers and mechanics employed on work done under contract for, or with the financial aid of, the United States, for any Territory, or for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

Two. A bill to provide for assistance to States in their efforts to promote, establish, and maintain safe workplaces and practices in industry, thereby reducing human suffering and financial loss and increasing production through safeguarding available manpower.

Three. A bill to amend the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, approved September 17, 1916, as amended, by providing for reimbursement of expenditures from the Employees' Compensation

Fund by Federal employing agencies, and for other purposes.

Four. A bill to prohibit discrimination on account of sex in the payment of wages by employers having employees engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce, and to provide procedures for assisting employees in collecting wages lost by reason of any such discrimination.

Five. A bill to provide for the payment of expenses of administration of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act by insurance carriers and self-insurers authorized to insure under section 32 of the act, and for other purposes.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an explanation of each of these bills, prepared by the Department of Labor, be printed in the body of the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks. And I also ask unanimous consent that these bills be permitted to lie on the table until the close of business on Monday so that other Senators who wish to join in sponsorship may do so.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bills will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bills will lie on the table, as requested, and the explanations will be printed in the RECORD.

The bills, introduced by Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself and other Senators), were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, as follows:

S. 814. A bill to establish standards for hours of work and overtime pay of laborers and mechanics employed on work done under contract for, or with the financial aid of, the United States, for any Territory, or for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

The statement, accompanying Senate bill 814, is as follows:

STATEMENT IN EXPLANATION OF BILL TO ESTABLISH STANDARDS FOR HOURS OF WORK AND OVERTIME PAY OF LABORERS AND MECHANICS, ETC.

This bill meets the great need in the field of labor-standards legislation for a single general hours act to revise and replace the group of complicated and overlapping statutes, dating back to 1892, which are known as the 8-hour laws. The President, in his budget message, has recommended legislation regarding these laws, which relate to hours of work and overtime pay for laborers and mechanics employed by the Government and on certain Federal contracts. The proposals embodied in this draft bill are designed to carry out these recommendations of the President and are a part of the legislative program of the Department of Labor.

The draft bill would improve the present 8-hour laws in three major respects: (1) By replacing the uncoordinated and confusing series of laws enacted at different times with a single statute simplifying and clarifying the present provisions; (2) by modernizing its hours standards through addition of a provision for a standard workweek of 40 hours with not less than time and one-half pay for work in excess of 40 per week; and (3) by making the laws' standards applicable not only to direct Government contracts, but also to those federally financed and assisted contracts with respect to which existing Federal legislation provides for the payment of prevailing or minimum wages.

SIMPLIFYING AND CLARIFYING THE EXISTING LAW

The present 8-hour laws, which govern hours of work and overtime pay of laborers

and mechanics employed on public work by the Federal Government and its contractors and subcontractors, were enacted at different times between 1892 and 1940. The 1892 statute replaced a statute dating back to the Civil War period. Certain provisions of these laws make it a crime for Government officials or Government contractors and their subcontractors to employ laborers or mechanics more than 8 hours a day. Others, which apply only to contractors and subcontractors, provide a separate and additional contract penalty of \$5 for each day's violation with respect to each worker permitted to work more than 8 hours. Many workers are covered by both provisions but there are some who are subject to the criminal statute only and others only to the statute providing the \$5 penalty. This bill would consolidate the existing laws into a single statute with simplified provisions which apply in the same way to all contractors and subcontractors performing work coming within its terms.

The bill would also eliminate the confusion and inequities which result from a number of conflicting and ambiguous exception provisions contained in the present laws. Some of the exceptions taking particular work out of the laws' coverage are canceled out by exceptions to the exceptions which put it back in again. And although the language of these laws prohibiting more than 8 hours' work in a calendar day has not been changed, there is still another independent statute that has the effect of relieving most contractors and subcontractors from this prohibition if they pay time and one-half overtime compensation for all work over 8 hours a day. The courts and the Comptroller General are in disagreement as to whether the present language of this law also gives the employees who work overtime the right to collect, by administrative or judicial action, the time-and-one-half compensation if the employer fails to pay it. This bill would make clear the liability of the contractor to reimburse laborers and mechanics to whom he has failed to pay time and one-half for overtime work as required by the bill.

### FORTY-HOUR WEEK PROVISION

In addition to a need for revising the language of the 8-hour laws to eliminate complicated and overlapping provisions, the present overtime provisions need amendment. Congress has established a straight-time workweek of 40 hours for Federal employment, for work connected with interstate commerce under the wage and hour law, and for work on Federal supply contracts under the Walsh-Healey Act. Many responsible contractors who perform Government contract work covered by the 8-hour laws have adopted this 40-hour standard. However, there are other contractors performing Federal work who require laborers and mechanics to work up to 56 hours a week (seven 8-hour days) without paying them overtime compensation. The bill would modernize the hours standards of the 8-hour laws by adding a requirement for the payment of time and one-half for work in excess of a 40-hour week.

### CHANGES IN COVERAGE

The third needed improvement in the 8-hour laws is an extension of their scope to include work financed in whole or in part by the Federal Government under statutes which require the payment of prevailing or minimum wages. The contract work presently covered by the 8-hour laws is work contracted out directly by the Government. When these laws were developed, this coverage made the hours standards applicable to substantially all the work for which Federal funds were expended. This is no longer so. Many non-Federal agencies now do the actual contracting for work that is financed in whole or in part with Federal funds or with the aid of Federal guarantees but which is, nevertheless, subject to Federal supervision or participation in details of spending

the funds, and to Federal laws providing for payment of predetermined prevailing or minimum wages. The coverage of a revised hours law should extend to this federally aided work. Extension of Federal standards with respect to hours of work and overtime compensation to those contracts already subject to Federal wage standards would not impose any undue burden on the Federal financing agencies, the non-Federal contracting agencies, or the contractor. The draft bill, therefore, provides that its hour standards shall apply to all contracts for work financed in whole or in part by loans or grants from, or insured or guaranteed by, the United States or any agency or instrumentality thereof under any statute of the United States providing wage standards for such work, which provisions of law are in effect on the date of enactment of the proposed legislation. Section 105 of the draft bill grants the Secretary authority sufficiently broad to issue rules and regulations conforming the Federal standards with respect to hours of work and overtime compensation to the dollar limitation on coverage of such statutes as the Davis-Bacon Act and the Federal Airport Act.

Since the labor standards provided in the bill would be applicable only to contracts and subcontractors, its enactment would terminate the application of the 1892 statute to employees of the Federal Government and the District of Columbia, as was proposed in S. 1926, 83d Congress, 1st session, a bill approved by the Bureau of the Budget. For this reason a necessary amendment to existing legislation relating to Federal employees is included in section 201 of the bill, which follows the language used in S. 1926.

#### COORDINATION OF ENFORCEMENT BY FEDERAL AGENCIES

Inasmuch as the proposed legislation would take the place of labor standards laws with respect to which the Secretary of Labor is given coordinating authority under Reorganization Plan No. 14 of 1950, a provision continuing this authority is included in the bill. There is also a provision affirming the applicability, in accordance with its terms, of section 2 of the Copeland Act, as amended, giving the Secretary of Labor certain authority to issue regulations for contractors and subcontractors on work of a character similar to that covered by the bill.

#### ADMINISTRATION AND ENFORCEMENT

The bill would make it clear that contractors and subcontractors responsible for violations will be liable to employees for the unpaid wages, as well as liable to the Government for liquidated damages in the amount of \$5 for each calendar day in which the employee is required to work in excess of the specified hours without payment of the statutory overtime compensation. This latter provision corresponds to the penalty provision of the 1912 act. A criminal penalty is provided for intentional violations, as is now done by the 1892 act.

The draft bill provides for the withholding by the Federal agency concerned of sums due a contractor in such amounts as are administratively determined to be necessary to satisfy liabilities for unpaid wages and liquidated damages. Similar withholding of funds is now authorized under existing law and standard contract provisions. In addition, under the bill the Comptroller General is authorized to make direct payment of such sums withheld for unpaid wages to reimburse underpaid employees.

As is now the case under the 1912 act, contractors would have the right to appeal to the head of the agency for a review of the administrative determination of sums withheld for liquidated damages. The bill is somewhat less rigid with respect to liquidated damages than the 1912 act, which provides no relief from the \$5 a day "penalty" once violations are established, except by action of the

President under authority limited to a very narrow category of situations. The bill provides that the agency head, in the event of appeal, may issue a final order affirming the administrative determination or, in a proper case, may recommend to the Secretary of Labor that an adjustment be made in liquidated damages or that the contractor be relieved of liability. It is provided that the Secretary of Labor may issue a final order affirming or rejecting this recommendation. Final orders of the agency head or the Secretary would be subject to judicial review by the Court of Claims upon a proper showing.

While no special provision for a similar review of the liability for unpaid wages is contained in existing law or in the bill, where sums are withheld for unpaid wages appropriate provision may be made by regulations under the bill for protecting interests of the respective parties which may depend on determinations of violations or other issues involved in any pending statutory review of liability for liquidated damages.

S. 815. A bill to provide for assistance to States in their efforts to promote, establish, and maintain safe workplaces and practices in industry, thereby reducing human suffering and financial loss and increasing production through safeguarding available manpower.

The statement, accompanying Senate bill 815, is as follows:

#### STATEMENT IN EXPLANATION OF BILL TO PROVIDE FOR ASSISTANCE TO STATES IN THEIR EFFORTS TO PROMOTE, ESTABLISH, AND MAINTAIN SAFE WORKPLACES AND PRACTICES IN INDUSTRY, ETC.

There is a serious urgent need for action by the Federal Government to aid the States in their efforts to prevent industrial accidents. The attached draft bill meets that need by providing for financial and technical assistance to the States in developing and expanding industrial safety programs. The proposal embodied in the bill is a part of the legislative program of the Department of Labor for 1957.

The proposed legislation would provide for assistance to State agencies administering labor laws relating to industrial safety programs. Under this proposal, the development of safety codes would be left to the States and the Federal Government would provide assistance to the States in their efforts to develop safety standards and safe practices, to promote voluntary acceptance of the standards and to secure observance of the code.

#### NEED FOR EXPANDING INDUSTRIAL SAFETY PROGRAMS

The prevention of industrial injuries is a matter of the greatest national importance, both in terms of the general welfare of the working population and in terms of the reduction of the social costs of industrial casualties. According to the National Safety Council the passing of each hour is marked by the death of 2 workers through job accidents; every 17 seconds an American working man is injured on the job. These tragedies occur around the clock—day in and day out. They result in permanent total disability, permanent partial disability, and total temporary disability, as well as death.

Accidents in the course of employment resulted in the appalling total of 14,200 deaths and 1,915,800 injuries during the year 1955 alone. This resulted in a loss of 39 million man days of production. To this must be added time lost from injuries experienced in preceding years, which would bring the total for 1955 up to over 200 million man days. The National Safety Council has estimated that visible and indirect costs of 1955 work accidents to employers amounted to \$3½ billion.

If these figures represented the inevitable minimum of annual industrial casualties,

there would not be much to do except deplore the human costs of our industrial processes. However, that is not the case. As a result of experience in the field of industrial accident prevention during the past 40 years safety experts generally believe that we know how to prevent over 90 percent of all work injuries. Where sound safety measures have been adopted there has been a substantial decrease in accidental injuries. For example, several of our largest industrial corporations have reduced their accident frequency 90 percent or more in 40 years.

Although many nongovernmental agencies have aided in the development and adoption of safety standards to apply in their respective fields, there must be a great increase in application of safety measures if the problem is to be met. But tested safety techniques have not been fully applied to all American business, especially to the establishments too small to afford full-time safety engineers.

#### NEED OF THE STATES FOR ASSISTANCE IN EXPANDING THEIR PROGRAM

Except where the national interest is directly affected, as in mining, or where the Federal Government has direct responsibility, such as to longshoremen and harbor workers on navigable waters of the United States, the regulation of industrial safety is a proper function of the States.

However, State labor departments with primary legal responsibility and better access to industrial establishments have not, despite strong and sometimes successful efforts, obtained sufficient funds to employ adequate staffs. Thus, the resources of most State agencies have been totally incapable of carrying out the basic responsibility of the State in this field. More than two-thirds of the State agencies with responsibility for safety programs reported that in 1952 they did not have sufficient staff to make one inspection per plant annually in the industrial establishments coming under their jurisdiction.

A study made for the President's Conference on Occupational Safety in 1949 showed that of 37 States reporting, less than two-thirds spent for industrial safety as much as 10 cents per year per worker. Only 2 States spent as much as 50 cents per year. The range in expenditures per worker was from \$0.009 to \$1.77, the average for all States being 23 cents per industrial worker. The ratio of safety inspectors to the number of industrial wage earners in these States ranged from 1 to 5,300 to 1 to 236,600, and the number of establishments per inspector ranged from 382 to 16,884.

#### PROPOSED PROGRAM FOR ASSISTANCE TO THE STATES

The draft bill provides that the Secretary of Labor shall allot funds to the States on the basis of the number of wage earners, industrial hazards, financial needs of the States, and such other factors as he deems relevant. The annual allotment to any State would not be less than \$15,000.

The annual payments to any State during the first and second years of the program would not exceed 75 percent of the annual expenditures under the State plan during those years. During the third and fourth years it would not exceed 66½ percent, and thereafter it would not exceed 50 percent. The Secretary of Labor would be authorized to approve a minimum Federal payment up to \$15,000 on a per annum basis, without regard to these percentage limitations, if he finds that it is necessary to carry out the purposes of the legislation and of the State plan. This would assist States with approved plans to initiate and maintain safety programs in situations where unusual circumstances might arise jeopardizing the program planned or started because of temporary inability to provide the necessary share of State funds.



Before funds could be disbursed, each State would be required to file with and have approved by the Secretary a plan for a program of industrial safety that accords with certain general requirements set forth in the bill. Among other things, the State plan would be required to reflect an estimate of total cost of the State program and the extent of State contribution, in accordance with the percentage ratios of Federal grants to total costs of the State program, as set forth in the act.

These provisions are administratively sound and would adequately insure the economical use of Federal funds to help achieve the stated purpose of the bill. The program would pay big dividends toward reducing the \$3½ billion cost (visible and indirect) caused by industrial accidents annually.

S. 816. A bill to amend the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, approved September 17, 1916, as amended, by providing for reimbursement of expenditures from the employees' compensation fund by Federal employing agencies, and for other purposes.

The statement, accompanying Senate bill 816, is as follows:

**STATEMENT IN EXPLANATION OF BILL TO AMEND THE FEDERAL EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION ACT, APPROVED SEPTEMBER 17, 1916, ETC.**

The Federal Government, as the largest single employer in the Nation, has the obligation to utilize every means to reduce accidents among its employees. Experience has shown that voluntary efforts on the part of Government agencies can achieve outstanding results in reducing the number and severity of employee accidents. The unfortunate fact is, however, that most Departments and agencies have not developed sufficient concern with the problem to begin and continue effective safety programs.

It has been felt for some time that if the Departments and agencies were made to feel more conscious of the incidence, and the resulting cost, of accidents to their employees, more effective safety measures would be adopted and the accident rate correspondingly reduced.

In furtherance of this objective, President Eisenhower's budget message in 1955 and again this year recommended that the financing of benefit payments in employment injury cases be shifted from a single appropriation to the appropriations of the employing agencies. Legislation designed to carry out this objective was introduced during the first session of the 84th Congress (S. 1309 and H. R. 5751). Under the provisions of these bills, Federal agencies would have contributed to the maintenance of the employees' compensation fund by payment of a premium charge calculated in accordance with commercial insurance practices used in writing workmen's compensation policies.

It was discovered, however, that this type of bill would increase the expense of administering the Compensation Act by at least \$1½ million annually. Therefore the premium-charging method was replaced by a less complex system under which each agency would be charged only for actual payments made from the fund on its account. In accordance with the President's budget message of 1956, again urging consideration of this type of legislation, bills embodying this revised system were introduced as S. 3582 and H. R. 10538.

The attached draft bill, which is substantially identical with S. 3582 and H. R. 10538, would amend section 35 of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act containing provisions for an employees' compensation fund. At present all compensation and other benefits under the act are paid from this fund, which, in turn, is financed from annual appropriations for the purpose. The purpose of this bill is not to shift the responsibility for the actual paying of ben-

efits to individual agencies but merely to require these agencies to reimburse the fund for money paid out on their account. There would be no danger that lack of funds or administrative delays would prevent anyone from receiving benefits to which he was entitled. Payments would be made from the fund under the continuing administration of the Department of Labor through the Bureau of Employees' Compensation.

All Government agencies and instrumentalities having employees eligible for benefits under the FECA would come within the coverage of this bill. The draft bill reestablishes the employees' compensation fund and provides that all payments under the act shall be made from the fund. At the end of each quarter the total costs of benefits and other payments made in that quarter on account of cases arising after July 1, 1957, would be determined by the Secretary of Labor for each agency. The Secretary would then bill each agency for that amount, and the agencies, in turn, would be required to pay the amount billed. Provisions are included in the draft bill which would require the heads of agencies to pay these charges from appropriations or funds used for the payment of salaries, wages, or other compensation of their employees. The proposed bill would allow for readjustment or correction of the charges billed by the Secretary, and would make an additional charge against corporations and agencies subject to the Government Corporation Control Act for their fair share of the cost of administering the act.

This manner of shifting costs to employing agencies is simple, inexpensive, and entirely consistent with sound business practices. Additional administrative costs resulting from its enactment are estimated at \$50,000 annually.

Considerable savings, both in money and, more importantly, in the safety and well-being of Federal employees, are expected to result from its enactment. In addition, the proposed bill would enable the Congress, on a cumulative and comparative basis, to evaluate the progress made by Federal agencies toward safer practices.

S. 817. A bill to prohibit discrimination on account of sex in the payment of wages by employers having employees engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce, and to provide procedures for assisting employees in collecting wages lost by reason of any such discrimination.

The statement, accompanying Senate bill 817, is as follows:

**STATEMENT IN EXPLANATION OF BILL TO PROHIBIT DISCRIMINATION ON ACCOUNT OF SEX IN THE PAYMENT OF WAGES BY EMPLOYERS HAVING EMPLOYEES ENGAGED IN COMMERCE OR IN THE PRODUCTION OF GOODS FOR COMMERCE, ETC.**

This proposal is designed to provide a means within the scope of the Federal regulatory power to eliminate discrimination in wage rates based on sex where men and women are performing comparable work for the same employer. It is a part of the legislative program of the Department of Labor.

The proposal would apply to employers whose employees are engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for interstate commerce. The administration of the act would be vested in the Secretary of Labor and procedures of enforcement and wage collection authorized similar to those now utilized by the Department of Labor in the administration of the Fair Labor Standards Act.

The payment of lower wage rates to workers of one sex for the same or comparable work as that performed by the other sex has an undesirable effect on the economic life of the entire Nation. Such practices tend to affect adversely the general purchasing power and the standards of living of

workers. Unfair competitive advantages are enjoyed by employers who pay discriminatory wage rates based on sex. In addition to the tangible economic ills caused by discriminatory wage practices, such practices violate fundamental principles of justice and impair the prestige of the United States in international affairs.

A nondiscriminatory wage level makes possible the maximum utilization of worker skills. This, together with collateral benefits, such as morale improvement, may stimulate production and lessen the effects of unfair competition.

It is of great importance that Congress eradicate discriminatory pay practices in interstate commerce.

**EQUAL-PAY PROPOSAL**

**Section-by-section analysis**

SECTION 1. Title of act: Establishes short title of "Federal Equal Pay Act."

SEC. 2. Findings and declaration of policy: Enumerates undesirable conditions in interstate commerce resulting from payment of wage differentials based on sex and intention of Congress to correct such conditions.

SEC. 3. Prohibition of wage rate differential based on sex: Prohibits employers having employees engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce from discriminating, on the basis of sex in payment of wages in any place of employment in which their employees are so engaged. The language descriptive of proposed coverage and the supporting definitions in section 10 are phrased to make available precedents established under the Fair Labor Standards Act in determining coverage under the proposed legislation.

SEC. 4. Administration: Authorizes the Secretary of Labor to issue rules and regulations, make investigations regarding compliance with the act, issue subpoenas, and restrain violations. These provisions are largely adapted from similar provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act.

SEC. 5. Wage restitution and liquidated damages: Provides that employers who violate the act shall be liable for wages of which an employee is deprived and for not more than an additional equal amount as liquidated damages. The liability in employee suits for unpaid wages and liquidated damages is like that now provided by the Fair Labor Standards Act, as modified by section 11 of the Portal-to-Portal Act.

SEC. 6. Enforcement: Authorizes employee suits to recover amount of employer liability under section 5. Authorizes Secretary to supervise payment of wages withheld in violation of the act and to bring suits for such wages in behalf of employees upon their request. The recovery of unpaid wages, but not liquidated damages, is authorized in suits by the Secretary of Labor or by administrative action in supervising employer payments. Establishes a 2-year period of limitation for commencing recovery action after cause accrues.

SEC. 7. Posting: Requires employer to post copy of act or official poster explaining its provisions in each place of employment where act applies.

SEC. 8. Unlawful discharge or discrimination and penalties: Makes it unlawful to discharge or discriminate against any employee assisting in the enforcement of the act. Upon a second conviction for such discharge or discrimination, imposes a criminal penalty. Provides that the United States district courts will have jurisdiction of criminal proceedings for violation of this section.

SEC. 9. Injunction proceedings: Provides that the United States district courts will have jurisdiction to restrain violations of the act or regulations issued under it.

SEC. 10. Definitions: Defines terms used in the act principally as defined in the Fair Labor Standards Act.

SEC. 11. Appropriation: Authorizes necessary appropriations to carry out act.

SEC. 12. Effective date: Provides that act will take effect 120 days after passage.

S. 818. A bill to provide for the payment of expenses of administration of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act by insurance carriers and self-insurers authorized to insure under section 32 of the act, and for other purposes.

The statement accompanying Senate bill 818 is as follows:

STATEMENT IN EXPLANATION OF BILL TO PROVIDE FOR THE PAYMENT OF EXPENSES OF ADMINISTRATION OF THE LONGSHOREMEN'S AND HARBOR WORKERS' COMPENSATION ACT BY INSURANCE CARRIERS AND SELF-INSURERS, ETC.

The American system of workmen's compensation is not financed out of general taxation but places its costs only on those members of the public who are also employers. In accordance with this concept, employers are charged with the costs of payments to injured employees either as self-insurers or through insurance carriers. In many States employers are also charged with the administrative costs of the workmen's compensation program. Under the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, however, a Federal statute which applies to certain private employments in much the same manner as a State workmen's compensation law, the costs of administration are borne by the Federal Government. This places on the Federal Government a burden inconsistent with a basic concept of workmen's compensation.

The draft bill would charge administrative costs under the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act to the industry covered by that act. Under the proposed bill the funds necessary for administrative expenses (direct expenses and the applicable share of indirect and overhead expenses) would continue to be fixed and appropriated annually by Congress. However, at the end of each fiscal year, the cost of administering the act during that year would be determined by the Secretary of Labor and prorated among insurance carriers writing insurance under the act, and among self-insurers. The Secretary would then assess each carrier on the basis of the total premiums collected by it, and each self-insurer on the basis of the premiums, as determined by the Secretary, that it would have paid had it insured its liability under the act.

It is estimated that this proposal, if adopted, would result in a reimbursement to the Federal Government of over \$600,000 a year.

The rights of a self-insurer or carrier would be protected by an administrative hearing on assessments, if requested, and by a right to judicial review on questions of law. The draft bill provides, however, that no stay of payment with respect to an assessment would be permitted.

If it failed to pay the amount assessed when due, a carrier or self-insurer would be liable to fines and interest on unpaid balances. Similar penalties and possible suspension or revocation of its authorization to insure are provided where a carrier or self-insurer misrepresents material facts or fails to furnish information called for by the bill or by regulations of the Secretary.

This proposal would also apply to all extensions of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act. The existing extensions are the District of Columbia Workmen's Compensation Law, the Defense Base Act, and the Outer Continental Lands Act. The reimbursement to the Federal Government, estimated above at over \$600,000, includes reimbursement for the administrative costs involved in the Defense Base and Outer Continental Lands Acts.

An additional \$200,000, now included in the budget of the municipal government of the District of Columbia, is transferred annually to the Department of Labor for the administration of the District workmen's compensation law. The draft bill would credit to the District government its share of the reimbursement received from the carriers and self-insurers.

The Secretary would also have authority, in his discretion, to establish a single, consolidated administration fund for the act and its extensions, or to have separate administration funds for the act and the respective extensions.

AMENDMENT OF IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT

MR. IVES. Mr. President, I am about to introduce a bill. I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to speak for 4 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator may proceed.

MR. IVES. On behalf of the junior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], and myself, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which would amend the Immigration and Nationality Act. Similar legislation was introduced in the 83d and 84th Congresses in both the Senate and the House of Representatives.

This bill contains three titles. The first title is designed to eliminate certain serious injustices under the existing law, which were specifically pointed out by the President in a letter to the then chairman of the Subcommittee on Immigration of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] dated December 5, 1953. Among the problems dealt with are the unrestricted authority of Consuls and the Attorney General to give or deny visas without supporting evidence; the repeal of sections 350 and 352-355, which provide for loss of citizenship because of residence abroad for both native-born and naturalized citizens; the restoration of preexamination which permitted an alien in the United States to become a permanent resident by obtaining his visa in Canada, and the change in the standard for granting suspension of deportation from "exceptionally and extremely unusual hardship" to "serious hardship."

The second title deals with procedural injustices and inequities which have developed in the administration of the law. Among these are the need for the statutory creation of an Administrative Appeals Board in visa cases to review the questions involving the denial of visa and the application or meaning of State Department regulations applying to immigration.

The third title modernizes the quota system by establishing the 1950 instead of the 1920 census figures as the basis for determining national quotas. This would go far toward alleviating the serious discrimination that exists with respect to nationalities of southern and southeastern Europe, from which area immigration is practically impossible

today. Moreover, it provides for the redistribution of unused annual quotas to those on waiting lists of countries with quotas of 12,000 and under.

I realize that other proposed legislation to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act has been introduced embodying certain recommendations of the Eisenhower administration. This bill should not in any sense be considered to be in any way a substitute for the legislation proposed by the administration. This bill contains many provisions, including the ones which I have herein mentioned, which are not touched upon in the administration's proposed legislation, with the exception title 3. Therefore, I am hopeful that the most important provisions of this bill will be included in urgently needed legislation amending the Immigration and Nationality Act.

I ask unanimous consent that this bill lie on the desk until the close of business next Monday in order that other Senators who may desire to act as cosponsors may be able to do so.

I further ask unanimous consent that the text of an analysis of this bill be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the analysis will be printed in the RECORD, and the bill will be held at the desk, as requested by the Senator from New York.

The bill (S. 836) to make certain changes in the Immigration and Nationality Act, introduced by Mr. IVES (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The analysis presented by Mr. IVES is as follows:

ANALYSIS OF BILL AMENDING IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT (McCARRAN-WALTER IMMIGRATION ACT, PUBLIC LAW 414, 82D CONG.)

SHORT TITLE—IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1957

Title I

This title follows recommendations of President Eisenhower as contained in his April 6, 1953, letter to Senator ARTHUR V. WATKINS proposing a Senate inquiry into the operations of the McCarran-Walter Act.

Section 101: Amends sections 212 (a) (15) and 241 (a) (8) of Public Law 414 with respect to standards for determining whether aliens are or are likely to become public charges. The provision which gives controlling effect to the opinion of the consul or of immigration officials, without adequate supporting evidence, is eliminated.

Section 102: Amends subsections (27) and (29) of section 212 (a) of Public Law 414 with respect to standards for determining whether immigrants would engage in subversive activities. The consul and immigration officials would no longer be vested with the authority, without restraint, to determine by their own mental process the probability of future prescribed conduct.

Section 103: Amends section 287 (a) (1) of Public Law 414 with respect to power of officers and employees of the Immigration and Naturalization Service to interrogate without warrant persons believed to be aliens as to their right to be or remain in this country. Strengthens the term "believed" by requiring "with probable cause," thus preventing improper interrogation of citizens.

Section 104: Repeals sections 352, 353, and 354 of Public Law 414, which provide for loss



of nationality by naturalized citizens because of residence abroad. This amendment thus eliminates the stigma of "second-class citizenship." Section 104 of the bill also repeals sections 350 and 355 of Public Law 414 which provide for loss of citizenship by native-born citizens because of residence abroad. The principle that native-born citizens will lose their American nationality by residence abroad was introduced to our nationality laws for the first time by Public Law 414. To permit that principle to remain in our law, while repealing the corresponding provision as to naturalized citizens, would discriminate against the native-born citizen.

Section 105: Amends sections 101 (2) (37), 212 (a) (28) (D), 241 (a) (6) (D) and 313 (a) (3) of Public Law 414 by broadening restrictions contained in that act with respect to persons who have advocated a totalitarian dictatorship or have belonged to totalitarian organizations. Nazis and Fascists would, as a result, be barred from the United States without the necessity of proving, as Public Law 414 now requires, that they have advocated, or belonged to organizations which advocated, the establishment of a totalitarian dictatorship in the United States. This closes the loophole in Public Law 414 that now permits Nazis and Fascists to enter the United States and to become naturalized.

Section 106: By amending section 244 (a) (1) (2) (3) (4) and (5) of Public Law 414 eliminates the standards of "exceptional and extremely unusual hardship" in granting suspension of deportation, substituting the term "serious hardship."

Sections 107 and 108: By repealing section 3 (c) of the Displaced Persons Act and amending section 201 (e) of Public Law 414 eliminates provision requiring future mortgaging of quotas.

Section 109: By amending sections 202 (a) (5) and 202 (e) and repealing section 202 (b), (c) and (d) of Public Law 414, eliminates quota provisions in the present act which discriminate against Asiatic and colonial peoples. The amendment will restore the law as it existed prior to Public Law 414, by which colonial peoples came under the quota of their mother country. Public Law 414 establishes a quota determined by race for Asiatic peoples no matter in what country of the world they are born while the quota for non-Asiatics is determined simply by birth within quota area. The amendment extends the latter provision to persons of an Asiatic race and thus removes the stigma of racial discrimination.

#### Title II

This title corrects certain administrative deficiencies that have become generally apparent since the beginning of enforcement of Public Law 414.

Section 201: By amending section 101 (a) (6) of Public Law 414, restored preexamination (an administrative procedure adopted in 1935 which permitted an alien in the United States to become a permanent resident by obtaining his immigration visa in Canada instead of being required to make the long and expensive journey to his country of origin for that purpose).

Section 202: By amending section 212 (9) and (10) permits entry of an alien who has received a pardon for a crime.

Section 203: Amends section 212 (c) of Public Law 414 to restore the law as it existed, and operated satisfactorily, from 1917 to 1952. The result would be to give the Attorney General discretionary power to admit an alien who is returning to an unrelinquished American residence of at least 7 years, with no requirement that the alien was originally admitted to this country for permanent residence.

Section 204: Repeals section 235 (c) of Public Law 414 which permits exclusion without a hearing.

Section 205: Repeals section 241 (d) of Public Law 414, the retroactive provision

which makes an alien deportable for conduct prior to December 24, 1952, even though that conduct was not a ground of deportation before Public Law 414 came into effect.

Section 206: Amends section 245 of Public Law 414 which permits the Attorney General to adjust the status of an alien temporarily here to that of an alien admitted for permanent residence. The amendment softens the unnecessarily rigorous requirements which an alien must now meet.

Section 207: (a) Permits judicial review in exclusion and deportation cases.

(b) Establishes a statute of limitations whereby no alien may be deported by reason of conduct occurring more than 10 years prior to the institution of deportation proceedings.

Section 208: Repeals section 360 (a) of Public Law 414 and substitutes a provision granting judicial review for a person claiming American citizenship who has been denied such right.

Section 209: Amends section 360 (c) of Public Law 414 by broadening provision for judicial review of final determination by the Attorney General in refusing entry to persons issued certificate of identity as claimants of American citizenship under section 360 (b).

Section 210: Establishes a Board of Visa Appeals in State Department to review questions involving the denying of visas and the application or meaning of State Department regulations applying to immigration.

#### Title III

Section 301: Provides for the pooling of unused quotas and their allocation the next succeeding fiscal year to those on waiting lists of quotas 12,000 and under (includes Italian, Greek, Dutch, Austrian, and Eastern European quotas). Quotas are to be determined on the basis of the 1950 census instead of the 1920 census as is now the practice.

### AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, one of the most glaring injustices in the Taft-Hartley Act is in the provision of section 9 (c) (3), that employees who have been replaced by an employer during the course of a dispute over economic issues "shall not be eligible to vote" in Labor Board elections.

This has long been recognized as a union-busting provision. Taken together with other provisions of the act, it makes possible a situation in which an employer can petition for a collective-bargaining election during a strike, the striking employees are held ineligible to vote, and their replacements cast the only ballots.

In a speech in 1952, President Eisenhower referred to this provision when he said:

I know the law might be used to break unions. That must be changed. America wants no law licensing union busting. Neither do I.

Yet, despite the widespread acknowledgment by leaders of both parties that this provision of the act is undesirable, it still remains on the books.

Mr. President, I therefore introduce, for appropriate reference, on behalf of myself, the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA], a bill to correct this injustice. It removes the prohibition against voting by employees on strike. It further provides that no election may be held during any

lawful strike in which recognition was not a bona fide issue when the strike began. The postponement of elections during economic strikes will give to employees a necessary and deserved protection against decertification of their union during a lawful strike.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 837) to amend section 9 (c) (3) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, introduced by Mr. CLARK (for himself, Mr. McNAMARA, and Mr. MURRAY), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

### PRICE REPORTING AND RESEARCH WITH RESPECT TO FOREST PRODUCTS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], the Senators from Oregon [Mr. MORSE and Mr. NEUBERGER], the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for price reporting and marketing research with respect to forest products.

As America emerges from a timber exploiting to a timber-cropping economy, it will more and more need to "farm" its forests. Timber-crop farming carries with it the need for frequent, selective cuttings in which small amounts of pulpwood, sawlogs, and so forth, will be removed and offered for sale at regular intervals. This means systematic forest management on the part of the several million owners of small forest tracts who, in all, control nearly two-thirds of our forest land.

For several generations the United States Department of Agriculture has been reporting prices on nearly every major and minor farm crop except forest products. This service has been of inestimable benefit to farmers in that it has given them an independent source of information upon which to price their products. They have not had to accept the word of a buyer. But in the case of forest products the forest owner still has no reliable independent source of information.

There are several hundred thousand independent sawmill men and logging operators who also offer rough timber for sale. This large group also lacks an objective source of price and market information. And as a result many of the transactions in the timber business are carried on by word of mouth, with abundant difficulties inevitably arising.

There is another major reason for currently reliable prices and workable data. The forest-products economy is not—and will not be—a free economy when such information is possessed by a few large buyers and is used to out-bargain small sellers. If we are to have a free and healthy forest economy—one in which neither people nor forests are subject to exploitive methods—access to objectively collected price data should be available to both sides in the discussion.

Although this bill does not provide for calculation of parity prices—partly because we have no price history upon which to base them—these should eventually be determined. I say this not because I feel that parity price supports would work in forestry, but to give sellers a measure of what would be a fair value. Parity calculations are carried out by the United States Department of Agriculture for nearly all farm commodities, and they furnish one means by which a farmer can decide on whether it pays him to grow one crop against another.

The Senate has recognized this problem by passing measures which I have sponsored designed to provide for forest products price reporting. Members of the House of Representatives are becoming aware of pressures by certain interests which seem to prefer monopoly to free enterprise.

I hope my colleagues will agree with me that forest crops are entitled to the same recognition, long overdue, accorded other farm crops.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with an article from the *Journal of Forestry*, dated December 1956, entitled "Some Statistical Needs in Forest Economics," written by Charles H. Stoddard, be printed in the *RECORD*.

The *PRESIDENT pro tempore*. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and article will be printed in the *RECORD*.

The bill (S. 840) providing for price reporting and research with respect to forest products, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. NEUBERGER, and Mr. SPARKMAN), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the *RECORD*, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That for the purposes of improving the management and use of forest resources and in order to provide farmers and other owners of small forest properties with current information on markets and prices and to aid them in more efficiently and profitably marketing forest products, the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized and directed to establish a price reporting service for basic forest products, including but not limited to standing timber and cut forest products such as sawlogs and pulpwood.

SEC. 2. The price reports made by the Secretary under section 1 shall be as to such species, grades, sizes, and other detail, and shall be made at such intervals, but at least quarterly, as he deems appropriate. Such reports shall be by State or forest regions or by such other areas as the Secretary considers advisable, and may, in his discretion, be made as to one or more areas in advance of other areas.

SEC. 3. In connection with the gathering of price information and the dissemination thereof, the Secretary is authorized to cooperate with the State foresters or other appropriate State officials or agencies, as well as with private agencies, and under such conditions and terms as he may deem appropriate.

SEC. 4. In the conduct of research activities under the act of May 22, 1928 (45 Stat. 699), and the act of August 14, 1946, title II (60 Stat. 1087), the Secretary of Agriculture is directed to conduct and stimulate research and investigations aimed at devel-

oping and demonstrating standards of quality, collecting and disseminating useful market information and developing methods for increasing the efficiency of the marketing and distribution processes for forest products as a means of increasing returns to farmers and other owners of forest properties.

SEC. 5. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to issue such regulations as he deems appropriate in carrying out the provisions of this act.

SEC. 6. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the purposes of this act such sums as may be necessary.

The article, presented by Mr. HUMPHREY, is as follows:

[From the *Journal of Forestry* of December 1956]

#### SOME STATISTICAL NEEDS IN FOREST ECONOMICS

(By Charles H. Stoddard)

Over the years foresters have become prodigious collectors of all manner of data on many of the important aspects of forestry. Detailed attention has been given to forest land acreages, timber volumes, growth and drain, and other aspects of the condition of basic resources by the Forest Surveys of the United States Forest Service. The most recent effort, the Timber Resource Review, has added materially to our quantitative measurements of the current American forest situation. Though there are still many gaps in land and timber data, we are at the point where we have a fairly adequate knowledge of the essential details.

In keeping with the fields of agriculture and industry, statistical data on lumber, pulp and paper production, and some other finished forest products, covering such items as wages paid, value added through manufacture, number of employees in manufacturing industries, industry profits, carloadings, and prices of finished and semifinished goods, are regularly reported and recorded. Such familiar sources as the Survey of Current Business, annual Statistical Abstract, Agricultural Statistics, Census of Business, Census of Agriculture and publications of the Bureau of Labor Statistics all contain some data on these various phases of forest products generally in their finished or semifinished form. The trade associations likewise publish excellent current production data on finished output.

However, between the time timber is severed from the stump and the time it is sold to a processor for manufacture, value is added through the expenditure of labor and the use of machinery. During this raw material stage many important areas of information are covered inadequately or not at all from a statistical standpoint. It is this aspect of forest economics with which this paper is concerned.

An example of the serious lack of continuous and substantive data on rough forest products is the 1954 Yearbook of Agriculture devoted to marketing which failed to include any mention of the raw material derived from forest lands save brief mention of naval stores. Although foresters have been saying for years that timber is a crop, the Department of Agriculture fails to include it as such in most of its important farm programing.

Little need be said to justify the value that additional statistical material can add to this or any other field. In today's economy where business and Government are engaged in continual efforts to maintain healthy and prosperous business conditions, measurements of rates of change of various sectors are completely dependent upon accurate, regularly collected data. It is taken for granted that in most other branches of our economy, agriculture, most industry, labor, and consumer interests, large bodies

of useful data must be available. No case can be made for collection of statistics as an end in itself, and this has sometimes been done, but certainly where clearly objective factual measurement will contribute to greater knowledge and understanding of a situation there can be little doubt as to the value of the effort. Furthermore, a free economy assumes that producer and consumer are fully apprised of changes in the economy in order that they may make informed decisions. To the whole field of forest economics, research and sound basic data are essential raw materials.

Because forest activity is a business as far flung geographically as agriculture, data gathering becomes a difficult and extended effort. Yet for years foresters have said, timber is a crop, while failing to insist on finding out how significant a crop it really is. Production of various kinds of round and rough forest products, points of origin, the prices at which they are bought and sold, employment generated, the wages paid, and the costs of woods production are only a few of the long list of items about which we lack statistical data. Although we have much information on the number of people and enterprises engaged in primary agriculture and the price received for farm products, nothing comparable is collected in forestry.

To obtain a more adequate picture of primary timber production activities many types of data now collected for agriculture would suffice. Without attempting to assign in detail agency or other responsibility for this task a simple enumeration may be useful at this point. The following incomplete list includes some of the kinds of data that would be useful; other types will suggest themselves.

1. In classifying types of farms under the Census of Agriculture timber or tree farms should be given a special grouping. This would provide a measure of the significance of continuous managed tree growing in the total forest land use picture as well as giving recognition to this special type of farming. Game farms, shooting preserves, trout farms, and other wildlife areas used commercially for other than usual farm crops should also be shown.

2. Complete enumeration of logging contracting firms and independent timber producers should be tabulated in the Census of Business in the same manner as other types of business. Included should be data on gross and net income, number of employees, total wages paid, and value and volume of output.

3. In the Census of Agriculture farm income from forest products is shown, but data revealing wages from off-farm woods work and income from sale of forest products cut from stumpage bought from others are intermingled but not shown separately.

4. Current prices of forest products should be collected and disseminated with market reports in the same manner as other farm products in order to keep forest owners and timber producers informed of developments in supply and demand. It is recognized that stumpage prices are more difficult to obtain and present. Further study may be required before actual data can be disseminated. Sawlogs, pulpwood, railroad ties, posts, piling, and rough lumber are all subject to standard grading rules and may be classified for pricing fairly simply.

5. While data on employment, income, and wages in wood-processing industries and company logging camps are collected, none are obtained for self-employed woods workers or those employed in "gyppo" operations. These comprise a large portion of woods workers in the Eastern States.

6. Current and prospective market information should be made available through reports comparable to those now published by the United States Department of Agriculture for many other farm commodities.



The desirability of including parity calculations in forest products price reporting has been advanced by some and questioned by others. Recognized as a useful but highly imperfect yardstick for measuring relative changes in the purchasing power of a commodity, parity prices have been calculated for many decades by the United States Department of Agriculture on about 130 commodities. The concept of price supports as related to parity began in the 1930's and programs have been limited chiefly to a dozen or so basic products.

Forest owners who are only occasional sellers of timber products usually have no basis for judging the adequacy of currently offered prices, in the experience of the writer. Since standing timber can be withheld from the market when prices are low in relation to other commodities, a parity price would be a useful standard for many sellers. But because historical price data for base periods are so inadequate, parity calculation would be difficult. That parity calculations would lead to price supports is highly improbable since cut timber is difficult to store for any length of time. In any case timber does not press on the market the minute it is ripe. Though difficult to determine, parity calculations would be helpful to owners and sellers.

#### JOURNAL OF FORESTRY

That professional foresters have not urged various agencies to undertake collection of these data long before this may possibly be indicative of the lack of intensive forestry until recently. That enrichment of our field of knowledge should receive the support of everyone interested in forestry activities would appear obvious. But strangely enough, complete agreement does not exist in all quarters. Price reporting in Georgia is said to have been discontinued under pressure. Only in Oregon, Wisconsin, and New Hampshire are continuous efforts made to supply current information to producers. In those States the extension foresters have pioneered in this undertaking with little encouragement. In recent legislative proposals forest products price and market reporting was specifically provided for, but met defeat for a variety of reasons.

Until these and other data needs are met, understanding of the operation of our forest economy will continue to be inadequate. To the extent to which foresters and forest landowners continue to lack basic data just so long will we be unable to carry out research needed to solve difficult problems. And so long as sellers lack the market knowledge possessed only by buyers will this sector of our economy fall short of being completely free. When these conditions are met, timber will be generally recognized and given status as a crop.

#### PRICE REPORTING SERVICE ON BASIC FOREST PRODUCTS

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for establishing a price reporting service for basic forest products.

Through the years, I have been especially interested in our small and family farmer and have supported legislation which would give them better opportunities for increasing their income. I believe that our forestry program offers great opportunities to all landowners, including small landowners, and this bill is designed to assist small farmers in obtaining better price information for marketing their timber products. Our national welfare is greatly dependent upon a continuous supply of wood products from the 489 million acres of commercial forest land in the United States.

Of this total area, three-fourths is held by 4.5 million private owners. Of these, 3.4 million, or 75 percent, are farm owners, who control one-third of the total commercial forest land area. Approximately 3.9 million individuals, including farmers, hold less than 100 acres of commercial forest land each.

These many small landowners control one-third of the commercial forest land, but they do not have access to current marketing prices for various kinds of standing timber or for many cut products. Their only source of information comes from the timber companies or other persons to which they sell. The Department of Agriculture collects and publishes information on practically every farm product except timber. There is a great need for this type of information to assist our many small farm woodland owners to determine the current value of their wood products. The timber production on small farms is at a relatively low rate when compared with Government and industrial producers. More adequate price information will tend to stimulate more interest in better woodland management. These small timber farmers would be encouraged to undertake reforestation measures and to take better care of their timber stands, which would in turn increase productivity and, in the end, mean a greater profit. I visualize this bill for better price information as a step toward an improved cycle that will contribute greatly to our forestry program.

There is a provision in the bill for studies to be made relative to the marketing of timber products. One important aspect of forest-product marketing that needs study is the establishment of sound, easily applied grades for logs, stave and veneer bolts, and other timber products. Farmers sell many other agricultural crops on the basis of grades which have been established by the Department of Agriculture. The selling of timber products on grade should also be beneficial to timber growers, but for many forest products no grading system has been established. This situation should be corrected as soon as possible.

Other research which might be conducted includes the developing of methods to increase the efficiency of the marketing and distribution processes for forest products. More specifically, studies should be made to determine more efficient practices for:

First. Moving logs from stump to mill.  
Second. Reducing logging and milling waste of usable wood.

Third. Using mechanical methods of handling bulky wood items, to reduce costs, and

Fourth. Binding lumber, rough staves, and other small semiprocessed wood products for cheaper unit handling with mechanical equipment.

The effect of these and other efficiencies should be to increase the net profit of timber growers and provide a uniform system of marketing.

Mr. President, I firmly believe that this decade will go down in history as a period of reawakening and awareness to the importance of our forests. This

industry is making great strides on every front, and timely price information as a guide to market opportunities is critically needed. This bill is a sound approach to providing real assistance to our many small landowners, and I hope the Senate will give it full approval.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 841) to provide for establishing a price reporting service for basic forest products, introduced by Mr. STENNIS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

#### AMENDMENT OF SECURITIES ACT OF 1933

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to raise the exemption under regulation A of the Securities and Exchange Commission from \$300,000 to \$500,000.

Accentuated by the tight-money policies, the chronic gap between financing availability and requirements of small business have never been more evident or compelling than in the past year. One means of small-business financing is by use of the securities market. While I recognize that the smallest concerns do not generally make use of this market because of high cost factors, companies of intermediate size should be enabled to consider the securities market as an important source of funds. It is, in fact, imperative that all avenues of finance be kept open for independent business.

I believe that the price rises since the exemption was last raised in 1945, and the rapid expansion of our economy, make it desirable to raise the SEC exemption from \$300,000 to \$500,000. I note that the SEC, itself, has in times past proposed the same increase. More recently, the President's Committee on Small Business also suggested the \$500,000 figure. I hope that we may have speedy action on this bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 843) further amending the Securities Act of 1933, introduced by Mr. SPARKMAN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

#### PROPOSED PROGRAM OF NATIONAL HEALTH INSURANCE

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I am about to introduce a bill. I ask unanimous consent that I may speak on it in excess of the 2 minutes allowed under the order which has been entered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator from Montana may proceed.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to establish a program of national health insurance.

Fourteen years ago, in company with several of my colleagues, I proposed the enactment of legislation for a comprehensive national health program which would promote the further improvement

of medical science and practice. Several times since then I have joined in the reintroduction of such proposed legislation. The program was designed to make available to all our people the benefits of modern medicine which too often are not accessible because good facilities and doctors are scarce or too far away or too costly.

In these 14 years, medical research and medical technology have recorded miraculous advances. Many new hospitals and other facilities have been built. Research facilities have been enlarged. New drugs and treatments have been discovered. Steps have been taken to augment the number of doctors, dentists, and other practitioners and their supporting personnel, and to help them work more efficiently. Most of these advances—particularly in research and the construction of facilities—have been stimulated or assisted through programs established by congressional action.

On the economic side of medical care, also, there has been a record of improvement during recent years, but it is doubtful whether this has even kept pace with advances in the art and science of medicine itself. In fact, the remarkable improvements in medical techniques have themselves been a factor in pushing the price of modern medical care beyond the financial means of millions of families.

The spread of voluntary insurance partially covering certain types of costs has helped substantially, particularly in enabling many of our people to meet hospitalization expenses and some of the expense of surgery. I have no wish to understate the importance and usefulness of such insurance within the limits of its availability. But the existing insurance programs do not protect against large elements of risk—risks which may prove calamitous for the individual families which may be stricken; and these insurance programs even now finance, on the average, considerably less than a third of the potentially insurable bills for medical care which may confront the average family or a family with income below the average. Large groups in our population, such as our 15 million people over age 65, shut themselves with limited or shrinking insurance protection, or entirely excluded from health insurance, at the very period in life when they have the most need for medical services and are least able to budget for the cost. Our farm families generally cannot share the advantages of group insurance; they must rely on higher cost individual insurance or none at all. The self-employed and the employees of small firms also are in most cases subject to similar discrimination.

Voluntary health insurance has done much and it can do more, but there is nothing in its history or promise to support an expectation that this device will ever remove the financial barriers to medical services for substantially all who need ready access to such services. Indeed, even assuming that the recent rate of expansion persists into the future, it will be many years before voluntary insurance will provide comprehensive protection against all significant health risks for even that part of the popula-

tion now covered by hospital-expense insurance—and about a third of our population still does not have even this basic coverage. Dental care is as urgent, expensive, and difficult to budget for many families as is medical or surgical care; yet the voluntary insurers and the dental profession have barely begun their studies of this problem.

A recent factual study by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—published in the December 1956 issue of the Social Security Bulletin—has shown that in 1955 there was indeed a rise of 16 percent in the dollar volume of voluntary health-insurance benefits, as compared with 1954. But the need was rising almost as fast as these expenditures. According to the research report, this rise in insurance benefits "was only sufficient to increase by 1.8 percentage points the coverage of the national-medical-care bill." Merely to keep up with population growth the dollar volume of benefits must rise by 2 percent a year, and, as the Department's study further points out, "If the costs of medical care continue to rise, the volume must increase even more if the same level of protection previously afforded is to be continued."

At their best, then, these existing programs are recording distressingly slow progress in closing the wide gap between actual medical-care costs and potential insurance protection. If the 1955 rate of improvement can be maintained—and this is by no means likely, since the extension of coverage obviously is at its most rapid rate in this early period of development—it will nevertheless be 30 years or more before voluntary insurance can cover the "potentially insurable expenditures" as defined in the Department's study. That is to say, it will be 1986 or later—more than a generation, mind you, Mr. President—before voluntary insurance at its 1955 rate of expansion succeeds in covering payments for services of physicians, hospitals, dentists, and nurses, and one-third of expenditures for drugs and appliances.

Take an even more modest goal: How long would it be, at the present expansion rate, before these plans covered as much as two-thirds of the potentially insurable expenditures? The answer is this: It would take fully 16 years. Not before 1972 or 1973 would we achieve a situation in which only 1 family in 3 would still remain without health insurance protection, or in which the average family could expect to pay, over and above its insurance premiums, not more than one-third of those medical-care costs which are now recognized as "potentially insurable."

Yet all the present Republican administration has been willing to offer is a plan of reinsurance that even the insurance companies rejected. More recently the administration has proposed that small insurers be exempted from the antitrust laws if they choose to pool their risks. These are timid, temporizing proposals. Neither plan would help noticeably to lower the voluntary insurance premiums or significantly increase the groups covered, the range of risks protected against, or the propor-

tion of medical costs insured for the average family. After 4 years of trying, the present Republican administration still is unable to offer a plan acceptable to the health insurance business and the professional health groups and service organizations, let alone a plan that will serve the needs of the public at large. Its reinsurance and pooling proposals are facades for inaction. Their adoption would not even accelerate noticeably the development of the existing voluntary insurance.

Thirty years—or even 16 years—is a long time to live with a problem when an effective solution is already at hand. We need not wait until 1986, or even until 1972, for an adequate program if we but have the vision and courage to take action now, in 1957.

While the administration continues its endless rounds of studies and conferences, insurmountable financial hurdles compel millions of our people to forego, year after year, the health services they need—services which are called for by modern standards of good care, services which are now technically feasible but carry forbidding price tags for many families, services which are already considered "potentially insurable" even by those who continue to delay positive legislative action.

And these unused services do not get into the total of current expenditures for health care. They do not even get into the national income accounts, except in a negative sort of way, for they represent a tremendous, irretrievable loss of productive power—a lowering of the national income below what it would otherwise be. If voluntary health insurance is now paying less than a third of the potentially insurable bills actually incurred for medical care, and the administration's own studies show that it paid under 30 percent in 1955, then obviously such insurance is paying a much smaller fraction of the bills that ought to be incurred if all our people are to enjoy good health.

The Nation cannot afford a small fraction of protection. The cost is too great in terms both of human suffering and lost manpower. An adequate program must cover substantially the whole population and it should protect each family and each individual against all significant risks. An adequate program should distribute each year's costs over the whole population instead of letting it be concentrated on those who suffer illness in that year. It should distribute each person's costs over his working life instead of concentrating the costs in his years of greatest adversity. This is a big order and it calls for correspondingly broad action. It calls for a national health insurance program. Nothing less will do the job.

Through a national health insurance program we can make more and better medical care available to all our people, in a way that preserves the individual's choice of doctors and the doctors' full control of their practice. By instituting national health insurance we can halt the further expansion of the existing large and uncoordinated public programs, financed by general tax revenues,



which have been found necessary to serve particular population groups for whom private insurance coverage has offered little or no help. Unless we adopt national health insurance, we shall be faced with irresistible pressures to add and expand Government-operated health services for additional groups—not only in the National Government, but also in the State, county, and municipal governments. At all levels, the publicly operated systems of medical and hospital care for selected categories of individuals are already substantial.

The bill I am introducing today omits several important features of earlier proposals for a national health program because these provisions or equivalent measures have already been enacted. I am proud to say that a substantial part of this record of accomplishment was achieved under Democratic leadership in the 84th Congress—a Congress which, as summarized in a recent news report, “enacted more health legislation than any of its predecessors in the past decade.”

This recent progress toward spelling out the rest of our national health program has enabled me to focus this bill on the insurance problem, omitting from it the following subjects which were covered in earlier comprehensive bills, such as S. 1679 of the 81st Congress:

First. The education of health personnel.

Second. Medical research.

Third. Expansion of the hospital survey and construction grant program.

Fourth. Special aid for rural and other shortage areas.

Fifth. Increased grants to States for State and local health work.

Sixth. Research in child life and increased grants for maternal and child health and crippled children's services.

I do not mean to imply that existing programs in these fields meet all present or foreseeable needs. Much remains to be done, particularly in the further promotion of research and in expanding the protective and preventive services of State and local health departments in rural and suburban, as well as urban, areas. We do not as yet have a separate Federal program for helping rural and other shortage areas to obtain more health personnel and facilities; however, the needs of these areas are accorded special emphasis in the Hill-Burton and other programs.

Thus, a start has been made on each major type of problem other than the question of insurance to cover the major costs of medical care.

The bill which I now introduce would provide the one major missing ingredient of our national health program. The national health insurance system would be a contributory system, similar in conception to our successfully time-tested programs of old-age and survivors insurance and unemployment insurance, and it would be similarly financed and operated. It would spread the cost over the entire working population, safeguarding all from the unexpected impact of unbearable expense. It would not change the practice of medicine, but it would establish a much more solid economic foundation for that practice. The pur-

pose of the proposed legislation is to provide a better system for financing our free system of medicine, and by this means to correct the existing maldistribution of health personnel and facilities.

How would the program work?

Under the policy of the National Health Insurance Act, insured persons would make payments proportional to their incomes from employment—but no one would pay on more than \$6,000 of such income in a year. Employed persons would be charged 1½ percent of earnings but not more than \$90 in a year for the highest paid worker; and their employers would match these payments. Contributions by the employers are, of course, an accepted practice in the social security system. Nor is this an innovation in health insurance. Employers are already paying about one-fourth of all health insurance premiums collected under existing plans.

Self-employed persons also would be covered, as would all persons who are entitled to old-age, survivors, or disability benefits under the Social Security Act and all who are entitled to an annuity under the Civil Service Retirement Act.

Insured individuals and their families would receive benefits as a right, not as charity. The care would include preventive and diagnostic examinations, laboratory and X-ray services, as well as curative treatment in the hospital or at home. Hospitalization would be provided up to a maximum of 60 days a year for each individual at the outset and for a longer period later, if feasible. Dental services and the more costly prescribed medicines would be covered, as would home nursing, special appliances, and eyeglasses.

To assure the availability of a full range of services in each State and health-service area, a program would be developed within each State for achieving the maximum participation and use of health personnel and facilities and to encourage improvement in their number and distribution throughout the State. It would be a positive objective and specific goal of the program to make available in all health-service areas, throughout the United States, the full range of medical, hospital, and other personal health services being underwritten by the insurance system. To this end, the bill specifies that payments for professional services, and the other terms and conditions of agreements with practitioners and others, shall be adequate not only to encourage high standards in the quality of services furnished, but also to provide professional and financial incentives to practitioners to advance in their professions and to practice in localities where their services are most needed.

Each individual would be assured full freedom to choose his physician or dentist and to change his choice as he desires. Physicians, dentists, and other professional persons furnishing services under the act would be assured full freedom in the practice of their professions, including the right to accept or reject patients, except as this right may be restricted by their own professional ethics or State laws. Administration would be based on the American principle of de-

centralization, with the States and local bodies carrying out the actual operations within the limits of the purposes, policies, and procedures specified in the law. The States would be authorized and encouraged to make service agreements with organizations operating voluntary health service insurance plans or other voluntary health-service plans. The Federal role would be limited substantially to collecting funds for distribution through the States to local practitioners and service organizations, and to establishing broad standards for operation of the system.

The amounts collected from workers and their employers, and from the self-employed, would be set aside in the Federal Treasury in a separate special account to be known as the “Personal Health Services Account.” To this fund the Federal Government would—if necessary—add, through appropriations from general revenue as determined by Congress, amounts equaling for any year not more than 1 percent of the covered payrolls. The payments to the States would be made from the special account.

Those persons, including the needy, who do not qualify as insured individuals or the dependents of insured individuals will receive health services under the program through arrangements to be made between the health-insurance system and appropriate public agencies of the National Government or of the several States or their political subdivisions. In such cases, reimbursements are to be paid to the health services account by the appropriate authority, and the bill provides expressly that there shall be available to the States, for the purpose of making such payments, the Federal grants which they receive for old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, aid to the blind, and aid to the permanently and totally disabled. Services furnished to noninsured individuals, including the needy, are required to be of the same quality, be furnished by the same methods, and be paid for through the same arrangements as services to insured individuals.

The national health-insurance bill would not change the practice of medicine, but by changing the way we pay for medical and other health services this program would enable the American people to finance more and better health care for all our people. It would bring the wonders of modern medicine within the economic reach of all. It would encourage preventive treatment, and it would permit earlier and more adequate treatment when illness strikes in spite of all preventive efforts. It would release millions of people from financial worries and intolerable debts which intensify their ailments and retard recovery.

Under this national health insurance system, each individual would go to his own doctor just as he does now. Freedom to choose and change doctors would be guaranteed and protected.

The doctor would treat each patient as he considers best. If laboratory work or specialist services or costly medications were required, the doctor would order them. The bill guarantees the doctor the right to join or not join the program.

It guarantees him political, professional, and economic freedom.

The main differences would be that the bills for services would be sent to the local body representing the insurance fund, rather than to the patient or his family, and the doctor would be free to give the best care the patient needs, without having to ask whether the patient can afford it.

An eminent medical leader has recently observed that, for an insurance payment of \$100 a person a year, medical science "could give a service the like of which has not ever been known, a service of a thoroughness, convenience, and efficacy such as to reduce the incidence, the severity, and the cost of present illness in our population."

My bill is more modest. It does not set the goal that high. But it would channel into the financing of medical care a sum greater than has ever before been devoted to this service in this country. In so doing, it would eliminate for a very large proportion of our population, those economic barriers which cut them off from adequate health services. No longer would those who suffer the misfortunes of illness be simultaneously overwhelmed by financial misfortune. For the population as a whole, all of us who have gainful employment in any year would help to share the cost of providing health care for the entire population in that year. For each individual, the costs of his health care would be spread substantially over his entire working life, rather than concentrated in the years of greatest adversity.

The result would indeed be a quality and completeness of health service the like of which has not ever been known. The results in human happiness, economic productivity, and national well-being will far outweigh the costs and the effort. And in truth, these are not additional costs. If we continue the long wait for voluntary programs to do this job, we shall pay out far more, over the next generation and longer, in wasted manpower, lost productivity, and needless suffering.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 844) to provide a program of national health insurance, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MURRAY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

#### NATIONAL OUTDOOR RECREATION RESOURCES REVIEW COMMISSION

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I am about to introduce a bill, and I ask unanimous consent that I may speak on it in excess of the 2 minutes allowed under the order which has been entered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator from New Mexico may proceed.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and Senators MURRAY, WATKINS, CARROLL, BARRETT, KUCHEL, and ALLOTT, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which I believe will be instrumental in helping to preserve a fine,

long-standing American tradition—the healthful and alluring appeal of the great outdoors.

We Americans are fond of hunting, fishing, camping, and all the other sporting activities connected with outdoor life. This is a fine tradition, and we want to preserve and foster it. Our outdoor resources will be as important and desirable to our country's future generations as they are to us.

I believe we have a duty to protect and preserve America's outdoor recreation heritage and opportunities. We cannot accomplish this by leaving it to chance or by taking our resources for granted. Outdoor recreation resources, like any other natural resource, can be protected and developed only by sound planning, intelligently based upon the fullest understanding of all the pertinent facts and requirements.

In brief, our Nation is confronted with a twofold situation. First, outdoor recreation activity is increasing at an accelerated pace. This has been caused by increases in population, more leisure time, and better modes of transportation. Last year, there were more than 50 million visits to our national parks and forests. There were more than 183 million visits to the State parks. There are in excess of 25 million licensed hunters and fishermen in our country today, and this does not include the millions more of our youngsters for whom a license is not required. In all phases of outdoor activities the trend is rising toward greater participation.

We are happy to see this increase in activities, but this brings us to the problem at hand. The space and resources upon which outdoor recreation depends are diminishing. The growth of our cities, highways, and industry have taken their separate tolls. More intensive utilization of all other products and resources of our lands and waters has made its force felt also. Of course, we do not propose that such elements of progress be slowed. However, we do suggest that the solution to the problem of greater outdoor recreation demand and diminishing resources requires that we plan wisely to obtain the fullest utilization of our resources for the future.

The proposed legislation would authorize the establishment of a National Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission which will enable us to begin to solve some of the problems I have mentioned. The Commission's task will be to undertake a comprehensive inventory and evaluation of the outdoor recreation resources of the Nation. It will project as scientifically as possible known trends of population and recreation habits and desires of the public, in order to estimate our future needs for continued outdoor recreation opportunity. Finally, it will develop recommendations for methods and programs which can serve as guides in future planning by the Federal departments, States, and private organizations.

It is not the intent of the measure to duplicate programs and studies now under way by various interested agencies. The bill provides that the Commission shall utilize fully all such material and

data available from the Federal departments, State agencies, or other sources. Further, the Commission is directed to make the maximum practical use of the facilities of the various States, universities, and other competent groups which may best be able to carry out particular phases of the review.

Implicit in the undertaking is the fact that all segments of our Nation have a big stake in the future of American outdoor recreation. Cooperatively, through the suggested review, we shall be able to gain an understanding of the problems and to participate fully in planning to meet the future.

Mr. President, I deeply appreciate the cooperation of other Senators and their staffs in the preparation of the proposed legislation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill may be printed at this point in the Record.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 846) for the establishment of a National Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission to study the outdoor recreation resources of the public lands and other land and water areas of the United States, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. ANDERSON (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That in order to preserve and develop for the American people of present and future generations such quality and quantity of outdoor recreation resources as will be necessary and desirable for individual enjoyment, and to assure the spiritual, cultural, and physical benefits that such outdoor recreation provides; in order to inventory and evaluate the outdoor recreation resources and opportunities of the Nation, to determine the types and location of such resources and opportunities which will be required by present and future generations; and in order to make comprehensive information and recommendations leading to these goals available to the President, the Congress, and the individual States and Territories, there is hereby authorized and created a bipartisan Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this act—

(1) "Commission" shall mean the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission;

(2) "Outdoor recreation resources" shall mean the land and water areas and the products of such areas of the United States, its Territories, and possessions which provide opportunities for outdoor recreation, including but not limited to such pursuits as hunting, fishing, camping, hiking, skiing, mountain climbing, pack-tripping, nature photography, scenic appreciation, boating, canoeing, and other water activities, wherever carried out or potentially carried out, including but not limited to such areas as the national forests, the public domain, Indian reservations, wild, wilderness, and primitive areas; national parks and monuments; wildlife refuge, habitat and management areas, both Federal and State; scenic areas, the marsh and wetlands, coastal beaches, reservoir, and such other land and water areas, irrespective of ownership, which presently provide or may in the future provide outdoor recreation opportunities.

(3) "Outdoor recreation resources" shall not mean nor include recreation facilities,



programs and opportunities usually associated with urban development such as playgrounds, stadia, golf courses, city parks, and zoos.

SEC. 3. (a) The Commission hereby authorized and created shall consist of 15 members appointed as follows:

(1) Two majority and two minority members of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, to be appointed by the President of the Senate;

(2) Two majority and two minority members of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to be appointed by the Speaker of the House; and

(3) Seven citizens, known to be informed about and concerned with the preservation and development of outdoor recreation resources and opportunities, and experienced in resource conservation planning for multiple resources uses, who shall be appointed by the President, and one of whom shall be designated as chairman by the President.

Vacancies occurring on the Commission shall not affect the authority of the remaining members of the Commission to carry out the functions of the Commission, and shall be filled in the same manner as the original positions.

(b) The Commission members shall serve without compensation, except that each member shall be entitled to reimbursement for actual travel and subsistence expense incurred in the services of the Commission and each member appointed by the President shall be entitled to a per diem allowance not to exceed \$50 per day when actually engaged in Commission business.

(c) The Commission shall convene as soon as practicable following appointment of its members, to implement the purposes and objectives of this act.

SEC. 4. (a) The Commission is authorized, without regard to the civil-service laws and regulations, to appoint and fix the compensation of an executive secretary and such additional personnel as may be necessary to enable it to carry out its functions, except that any Federal employees subject to the civil-service laws and regulations who may be assigned to the Commission shall retain civil-service status without interruption or loss of status or privilege.

(b) The Commission shall establish headquarters in the District of Columbia and shall make such other arrangements as are necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

(c) The Commission shall request each Federal agency with a direct interest and responsibility in any phase of outdoor recreation to appoint, and each such agency shall appoint, a liaison officer who shall work closely with the Commission and its staff.

SEC. 5. (a) There is hereby established an Advisory Council which shall consist of the liaison officers appointed under section 4 (c), together with 25 additional members appointed by the Commission who shall be representative of the various major geographical areas and citizen interest groups including the following: State game and fish departments, State park departments, State forestry departments, private organizations working in the field of outdoor recreation resources and opportunities, landowners, State water pollution control agencies, State water development agencies, private forestry interests, commercial fishing interests, commercial outdoor recreation interests, industry, education, labor, public utilities, and municipal governments.

(b) The functions of the Advisory Council shall be to advise and counsel the Commission in the development of ways, means, and procedures whereby maximum cooperation may be obtained from all criteria for evaluating outdoor recreation resources data assembled and otherwise to advise and assist the Commission in carrying out the purposes of the act.

(c) Members of the Advisory Council, except those employed by the Federal Government and assigned to the Commission as liaison officers, shall serve without compensation except that each shall be entitled to reimbursement for actual travel and subsistence expenses incurred in attending meetings of the Advisory Council called by the chairman of the Commission, or incurred in carrying out duties assigned by the chairman of the Commission.

(d) The chairman of the Commission shall call an initial organization meeting of the Advisory Council, a meeting of such Council each 6 months thereafter and a final meeting of such Council prior to transmitting the final report to the President and the Congress.

SEC. 6. (a) The Commission shall proceed as soon as practicable to set in motion a nationwide inventory and evaluation of outdoor recreation resources and opportunities, directly and through the Federal agencies, the States, and private organizations and groups, utilizing to the fullest extent possible such studies, data, and reports previously prepared or concurrently in process by Federal agencies, States, private organizations, groups and others.

(b) The Commission shall compile such data and in the light of the data so compiled and of information available concerning trends in population, leisure, transportation and other factors shall determine the amount, kind, quality and location of such outdoor recreation resources and opportunities as will be required by the year 1976, and the year 2000, and shall recommend what policies should best be adopted and what programs be initiated, at each level of Government and by private organizations and other citizen groups and interests, to meet such future requirements.

(c) The Commission shall present not later than December 31, 1959, a report of its review, a compilation of its data, and its recommendations on a State by State, region by region, and national basis to the President and to the Congress. Such report, compilation, and recommendations shall be presented in such form as to make them of maximum value to the States and shall include recommendations as to means whereby the review may effectively be kept current in the future. The Commission on request of the President or the Congress shall prepare interim or progress reports on particular phases of its review.

(d) The Commission is authorized to conduct public hearings and otherwise to secure data and expressions of opinion.

(e) The Commission is authorized to make direct grants to the States, from sums appropriated pursuant to section 8, to carry out such aspects of the review as the Commission may determine can best be carried out by the States, under such arrangements and agreements as are determined by the Commission; and may enter into contracts or agreements for studies and surveys with public or private agencies and organizations.

SEC. 7. The Commission, in its inquiries, findings, and recommendations, shall recognize that present and future solutions to problems of outdoor recreation resources and opportunities are responsibilities at all levels of government, from local to Federal, and of individuals and private organizations as well. The Commission shall recognize that lands, waters, forests, rangelands, wetlands, wildlife, and such other natural resources that serve economic purposes also serve in varying degrees and for varying uses outdoor recreation purposes, and that sound planning of resource utilization for the full future welfare of the Nation must include coordination and integration of all such multiple uses.

SEC. 8. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out the purposes of this act, which sums shall be available to the Commission

until expended but not later than June 30, 1960.

SEC. 9. This act may be cited as "The Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Act."

## RECREATION RESOURCES REVIEW

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, today I am joining my distinguished colleague from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and other Members of the Senate and the House in joint sponsorship of a bill which I confidently expect will meet with a large measure of bipartisan support in both Houses of Congress and in the country generally.

The Senator from New Mexico has described the bill in his introductory statement, so at this time I shall not go into the details of the bill. Suffice it to say that the bill, which will be known as the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Act, represents a considerable amount of constructive thought and action by the Izaak Walton League of America, which did the basic drafting of the measure. I particularly desire to commend Mr. Joseph W. Penfold, of Wheatridge, Colo., western representative of the league, and one of the moving forces behind this proposal. His fairminded and positive approach to the problems which prompted this proposed legislation, and his awareness of the importance of multiple use of our public lands, will, I am sure, do much to elicit a large measure of public support for this measure.

There are three points which I should like to cover very briefly:

First. This bill, if enacted, will be primarily factfinding legislation. It will set up a public bipartisan commission to ascertain the facts on our greatly expanding outdoor recreational needs and the pressures which are building up on our dwindling resources and facilities. Facts and recommendations arising from this study will assist the Congress and the various State legislatures in future legislation on this subject, and also will aid movements for effective State parks departments in my State and others.

Second. The bill recognizes the importance of multiple use of recreational resources, and of action on all levels of government. An advisory committee provided for in the bill will insure representation of geographical areas and of the various interests using the lands, waters, and other resources affected.

3. Costs will be reasonable, because the Commission will have access to a large volume of material already assembled by Federal and State Governments, by private organizations, and by educational institutions. I request unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks copies of agency announcements and publicity articles which indicate some of the activities already completed or underway in this research field, as follows:

Press release of United States Department of Agriculture dated January 15, 1957, describing Operation Outdoors.

Excerpt from press release of United States Department of the Interior dated January 1, 1957, describing resource conservation progress in 1956.

Press release of United States Department of the Interior, dated August 1,

1956, describing guide to recreational opportunities on western reservoirs.

Article from American Forests, August 1956, entitled "Multiple Use on Private Lands."

Editorial from the Deseret News and Salt Lake Telegram of December 28, 1956, entitled "Where Will Our Children Play?"

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WATKINS. Information produced by such studies as the National Parks Service's mission 66 program, the Forest Service's Operation Outdoors, and the Weyerhaeuser Timber Co.'s experimental development of public parks on private property—as reviewed in the material I have just submitted—can be collated and evaluated by the commission proposed in the bill.

The problem, I might add for the benefit of my eastern friends, holds far more urgency for the East than it does for the West. In the West we have many millions of acres of lands already reserved for national parks, national forests, wildlife refuges, and wilderness areas. Here in the East, with a few significant exceptions, there are tremendous pressures for the relatively few remaining acres suitable for public parks, wilderness, and seashore. Furthermore, at present there is no organized program on a State-Federal basis to determine future needs and to take steps to acquire and preserve recreational areas that are not already set aside. This bill will contribute to that end here in the East, and at the same time will give us in the West a better appreciation of the long-term requirements of our reserved recreational resources.

Meanwhile, we invite the city dwellers in the East to plan vacations in the West, where they can escape suburbia and can savor the satisfactions of outdoor recreation in mountain playgrounds and untrammelled wildernesses.

#### EXHIBIT A

##### OPERATION OUTDOORS DESIGNED TO DOUBLE NATIONAL FOREST RECREATION FACILITIES

Operation Outdoors, a plan to double camping and picnicking facilities in the national forests within the next 5 years to meet a steadily building demand for such facilities, was announced today by the United States Department of Agriculture.

Recreation visits to the national forests will hit the 66 million mark by 1962, Forest Service officials predict. Their estimate is based on the past rate of rise in recreation use of national forests, the growing population, increased time for leisure activities, and the upward swing in money spent for recreation.

The 5-year recreation plan was released following the President's budget message to Congress which recommended financial support of the project to start this year. The program resulted from the Department's study of various congressional and public proposals to balance recreation facilities with the mounting use. At the request of Congress a comprehensive survey of needs in the 150 national forests throughout the country has been made.

Operation Outdoors is a double-barreled program. First it aims at solving the problem of ever-increasing family outdoor activities such as picnicking and camping in the national forests. A second part will deal with improvement and management of wild-

life habitat in cooperation with State game departments. The report released today deals only with the family type recreation program and is designated part 1. Part 2 will be released later.

Some 2,150 new camping and picnicking grounds which will accommodate 40,500 additional families at a time are called for in Operation Outdoors. Tables and fireplaces are to be repaired and sanitary facilities modernized on the 4,900 camp and picnic grounds which now can properly accommodate only 41,400 families. As in the past, it will be left to private capital to provide and operate resorts and other special facilities in the national forests.

"Operation Outdoors is geared not only to correct existing unsatisfactory conditions at national forest recreation areas but also to meet foreseeable use during the next 5 years," Richard E. McArdle, Chief of the Forest Service, said. "At the same time, however, we must keep recreation in balance with the use of other national forest resources, such as water, timber, and forage."

"The American people are seeking outdoor recreation more than ever before. The national forests are feeling this boom with a tremendous increase in visits. Our existing facilities simply can't handle the load."

Recreation visits to the national forests hit an all-time high of 45½ million in 1955 as compared to 18.2 million in 1946. About 39 percent of the people camped and picnicked outside improved areas because existing facilities, largely built by the Civilian Conservation Corps between 1933 and 1941, could not take care of them.

Existing facilities have deteriorated under excessive use. Picnic tables, campfire grates, and sanitary facilities need constant repair. Sections of some popular areas have been closed for indefinite periods because facilities were completely worn out and funds have not been available to replace them.

Many people, unable to find a spot to picnic or camp in established areas, have gone to places where there are no sanitary facilities and no fireplaces. Streams that supply water to nearby towns and cities are being threatened with pollution and forest-fire danger is increasing. Through Operation Outdoors it is expected that these serious conditions can be alleviated.

A copy of the report Operation Outdoors may be obtained upon request to the Forest Service, United States Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.

#### EXHIBIT B

##### RESOURCE CONSERVATION PROGRESS IN 1956 NOTED BY SECRETARY SEATON

Significant progress in the natural resource programs of the Department of the Interior was recounted today by Secretary Fred A. Seaton in summing up the activities of the Department in the past year.

Secretary Seaton forecast additional solid accomplishments for the Department in 1957. He cited particularly two long-range conservation programs which he believes will make major advances during the next 12 months.

One of these is the mission 66 program of the Department's National Park Service. This comprehensive 10-year program will be in its second year. Its purpose is to provide the Nation in the next decade with a fully protected national park system adequate to accommodate the 80 million visitors anticipated by 1966.

The other long-range program given special mention by Secretary Seaton is a greatly expanded effort to develop and conserve the Nation's wildlife and fishery resources. The Secretary announced inauguration of work on the new program late in 1956. In directing the Department's United States Fish and Wildlife Service to develop a blueprint for

the broadened conservation effort, Secretary Seaton declared:

"The challenge of soundly managing our commercial fishery resources to assure a continued harvest and of meeting the growing demand for opportunities to fish and hunt at a time when those opportunities seem to be diminishing must be met headon."

#### EXHIBIT C

[From the Department of the Interior,  
August 1, 1956]

##### RECLAMATION ISSUES GUIDE TO RECREATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES ON WESTERN RESERVOIRS

How reservoirs constructed by the Bureau of Reclamation in the 17 Western States create and improve recreational opportunities for 10 million people a year is told in a newly published Bureau folder, Secretary of the Interior Fred A. Seaton said today.

The illustrated folder includes a map locating 140 recreational areas and a comprehensive chart showing the size of the lake and the facilities available. The chart shows the town or city nearest the reservoir and the name and address of the agency which administers the recreational facilities. Swimming, boating, fishing, camping, picnicking, and hunting opportunities are available at most reservoirs. Boat rentals, lodging, drinking water, picnic places, and other public facilities are generally provided by the administering agency or concessionaires.

The administration of recreational areas on Bureau projects is generally transferred to local, county, or State agencies, except where reservoir recreational areas have national significance. Where reservoirs are adjacent to or within Federal refuges, national forests, or national parks, such areas are usually administered for recreational purposes by the Fish and Wildlife Service, Forest Service, or National Park Service, respectively.

The recreational values of Bureau developments, important byproducts of western water development, are enjoyed both by residents of the areas involved and by visitors from every point of the Nation. In addition to the intrinsic values of relaxation, sport, sightseeing, and other elements of recreational use of water areas in the West, the play areas are an important addition to the national economy.

Commissioner of Reclamation W. A. Drexler said that expenditures by visitors to recreational areas created by Reclamation are conservatively estimated at \$59 million a year. This includes money spent for travel, food, lodging, and fishing, boating, and hunting equipment.

The Bureau folder, entitled "Reclamation's Recreational Opportunities," features the outstanding fishing and boating on the man-made water playgrounds. The great value and popularity of Bureau constructed reservoirs is enhanced, states the folder, by the fact that they are located in dry sagebrush country or deserts. Frequently, reservoirs are the only large bodies of water available for recreation for many miles around.

Habitat improvements for fish and wildlife are almost always included in reclamation projects with funds provided by the Congress. The fishing resources are often increased or improved with stock from State or Federal hatcheries.

The outstanding fishing and recreational values of reclamation reservoirs have recently been given wide recognition in articles in sports magazines. The folder quotes from such authorities as Ted Trueblood, Frank Dufresne, and Shep Shepherd.

The popularity of Bureau of Reclamation reservoirs as play spots is indicated by the 2,675,371 persons who visited Lake Mead at Hoover Dam last year; the 909,900 visitors at Jackson Lake, Wyo.; the 750,000 visitors at Buffalo Bill Reservoir, Wyo.; and the 605,024 visitors at Millerton Lake, Calif.



Copies of Reclamation Recreational Opportunities may be obtained from any Bureau field office or from the Commissioner of Reclamation, Washington 25, D. C.

# EXHIBIT D

[From American Forests of August 1956]

## MULTIPLE USE ON PRIVATE LANDS

(By Kramer A. Adams)

The late Aldo Leopold, professional forester who became the father of modern game management once said, "Most of our wildlife problems are concerned not with the management of game, but with the management of people."

Those of you who manage the forests realize that there's an increasing amount of human management involved in the business of growing trees. More and more, Americans are turning to their forests—private, State, and Federal—in search for recreation. And there's no indication of relief ahead for the forester.

To the contrary, with shorter work hours, greater mobility through modern vehicles, and added money to spend on recreational pursuits, more people will head for the woods in the coming years.

Most of us are aware that Stanford Research Institute has predicted that the Nation's need for timber products will increase about 25 percent by 1975. But did you know that the Public Affairs Institute has said that the demand for recreation by 1960 will be 36 percent above last year and by 1965 will be 75 percent greater?

Another reliable estimate places the number of people enjoying the outdoors in 20 years as about double what it is now.

Where will the public go in the future while on this recreational spree? Resorts? Golf courses? National parks and forests? Yes, but some facilities there were crowded this year. A recent survey shows that fishing is America's favorite sport. Next is hunting, and of the top 10 participation sports, 7 are primarily woods-type activities.

It is evident that more and more pressure will be placed on the private timber owner to open his lands.

In the words of the current popular song, Something's Gotta Give.

Since the end of World War II, Weyerhaeuser Timber Co. has opened increasing amounts of its Oregon and Washington timberland to the recreation seeker. During the current deer-hunting season, essentially all of its 2½ million acres that are not in operating areas bear the "Hunters Welcome" sign. Roughly half of the company's roads are open to hunter vehicle travel.

The company also maintains 11 public parks on its stream or lakeside property in the 2 States. Each offers piped running water, sanitary facilities, picnic benches and tables, fireplaces and free firewood. One has a children's playground and another a boat-launching ramp.

During the year, company lands are visited by more than 50,000 hunters, fishermen, campers, hikers, swimmers, horseback riders, picnickers, archers, rock collectors, skiers, bird watchers, photographers, sightseers, berry pickers, trappers, fern pickers, target shooters, dog field-trial participants, and wildflower gatherers.

Many other tree-farm operators have taken similar steps toward helping restless Americans get away from it all on private forest lands. But how much does this gesture cost? Just what happens when an army of hunters, for example, swarms over the forest seeking deer? Most of you, I'm afraid, know only too well.

To get some sort of a reliable answer to that question, each branch manager of Weyerhaeuser's western Washington tree farms was asked to observe hunter conduct during the 1954 hunting season. Their conclusions and experiences show that the average hunt-

er is neither as bad as he is often pictured by the landowner nor as harmless as usually drawn by his allies.

The questionnaire was designed to provide a point of reference upon which to base future public recreation policies for company lands, and, perhaps, to show both the sportsman and Weyerhaeuser people the way to even better relations.

Here are some of the questions asked: "Were any fires started that are traceable to deer hunters?"

Only 1 out of 9 respondents said "Yes." This amazing improvement over the normal number of hunter fires was helped in 1954 by the weather. So that, just as this year in the Northwest, it is impossible to tell how much credit goes to the hunter and how much to Jupiter Pluvius.

The threat of fire is still the primary reason across the Nation for barring entry to the forests—public or private.

"Were any roads damaged by hunter vehicles?" Tire chains tore up some soft roads; sheer volume of traffic caused damage at other points; motorcyclists were blamed for damage almost everywhere.

Two tree farms were victims of theft of company property. One forester's volunteered comment on this matter is significant. He said, "As a rule, the hunting season is only a cover for thieves who would be stealing anyway."

Four verified cases of lost hunters were reported requiring many man-hours of company time in the searches.

All areas reported malicious vandalism of some kind, ranging from dirt poured in the fuel tank of a D6 Caterpillar to mutilation of temporary signs. Six tree farms suffered a total of 14 broken locks or gates.

We also asked tree-farm managers, "Were your road signs and warnings generally respected?" The reply offers hope for the future of hunting. Weyerhaeuser people were unanimous in their opinion that hunters last year paid more heed to our road and warning signs.

As to violation of the State hunting laws, the Washington Game Department reported arrests by game protectors for 18 major offenses.

Aside from outright closure of private property, there are two ways to approach the matter:

1. By education of the hunter.
2. By stricter control of the hunter in the field.

Education or hunter control or a combination? Each of these methods will be given a test during coming deer-hunting seasons.

In Oregon, timbermen, farmers, the State game department, and every organization concerned with hunter conduct, have pledged cooperation in the Governor's Red Hat Day program. This is the educational effort designed to better relations between landowners and hunters.

There is every indication that this voluntary program is succeeding in legitimizing the red hat and opening the gates to happier hunting grounds.

The amazing success of the Smokey Bear campaign, the keep-green programs, and similar efforts prove that public education can be effective.

The other approach, closer hunter control, will be tried next year on one of Weyerhaeuser's tree farm properties in western Washington. Here, four large management units will be operated during the general buck-hunting season. The game department has given tentative approval to taking over one unit. A local sportsmen's group will manage hunters on another unit, and the company will experiment with hunter control on two similar-sized units.

Modern logging methods have created near-ideal conditions for wildlife in some areas, which has brought on an increase in their populations. By law and tradition, the game

belongs to the people. What better way to control an increasing wildlife population than by unlocking the gate and allowing the hunter to take the surplus?

"Multiple use" is a much misunderstood catchword that usually means "Federal forests" in the public mind. It has that connotation primarily because of the excellent job done by the Forest Service in making its lands available to hunters and fishermen and in providing campsites and other recreational facilities. Here's the popular appeal; the individual's tangible benefit from the forest.

Most private forest-land owners are now practicing true multiple use. In addition to keeping the forests productive, their management methods protect the watershed, help build the soil, provide room and board for fish and game and protect man and wildlife from fire and stream pollution. These facts are not generally understood.

The unfairness of the public's attitude is highlighted by the fact that millions of acres of easily accessible private forestlands across the country are now open to hunting, fishing and other recreational opportunities. Catering to the outdoorsman costs Weyerhaeuser Timber Co. many thousands of dollars each year—with no thought or desire of tangible return on the investment.

Records show that in the Pacific Northwest's Douglasfir region, four big game animals are taken from private forests for every one taken from Federal forests. Mike Hudoba in the March issue of "Sports Afield" states that 85 percent of the Nation's hunting is done on private property.

There are many dangers in this mistaken public viewpoint which draws a line between public forest "multiple use" and the supposed private forest locked gate.

How can we focus public attention on all the important values of the Nation's privately owned forests? They've been told about the economic benefits of a well-managed harvest of timber; they may know about the fire and watershed protection provided by private landowners; and they may be aware of the improved governmental services made possible by huge taxes on private timberlands.

But these are distant colorless things. "Multiple use" has come to mean free public recreation, more than anything else. It's memories of fishing, camping, hunting, skiing, or traveling on so-called public lands.

Opening up of more private lands for recreation—where it doesn't interfere with the major purposes of forest management—is a start toward overcoming this mistaken public attitude on "multiple use."

It would mean recognized cooperation with the public under controlled conditions. By dispersing recreationists, less trouble and pressure would be experienced by the Federal, State, and private lands now opened. During hunting and fishing seasons, it will assure a better utilization of the game and fish crop.

Many of the users of private forestlands are employees of the landowner. Here's an important industrial relations advantage—another "fringe benefit" that makes living and working in the community more desirable. Employees should not, however, be given exclusive privileges, but should have the same opportunity as others to enjoy the forests.

But in opening the woods, how can we assure ourselves that these visitors will not start fires, will not damage roads or property, will not steal equipment nor litter the forest?

In removing the physical and psychological barrier between the recreationist and the private forest, the landowner has taken a great step in solving some of these problems. He has immediately become a friend of the outdoorsman. This generous overture is more often than not rewarded by improved community and public relations, a

greater sense of responsibility on the part of visitors, and a decreasing vandalism rate. We've found that recreation seekers are grateful for the privilege of roaming Weyerhaeuser lands unhindered. Hundreds of commendatory letters testify that hunters are human, too.

This is a display of faith that rubs off on most thinking sportsmen. But this throwing away of the key must be accompanied by suitable publicity to constantly remind visitors that they are on private land and have a trust to protect it and to behave themselves. And we cannot compromise the necessary fire closure laws now on the statute books.

Who are these people on the other side of the fence? Do you know them as well as you should? They don't all wear horns; are not all practicing arsonists or sign shooters.

The forest visitors are your neighbors, living in or near the mill community, who will stick up for a friendly company when it is in trouble.

They are the ones who vote and who influence forestry legislation. They are the citizens who buy our products and who log our woods and run our mills.

They are the sportsmen who pay license fees to manage and plant the game fish in waters on or near our forests; who pay the salaries of the game managers who have the power to control wildlife depredations.

These are the people who can be auxiliary fire wardens—a farflung, voluntary patrol so huge that no landowner could afford to pay for the service.

They are also the people who can prevent theft and vandalism in the woods and damage to roads.

Recreation and forestry are compatible. But just as in this Nation's potential timber production, we have not reached the limits of what might be called recreation production. The demand for, and value of, both products of the forest is destined to increase. When we think of multiple use in the future, let's add plans too, for a sustained yield of good landowner-sportsman relations.

"The forest industry's tree farm recreation program has come of age," said Frederick Billings, Public Recreation Administrator, Weyerhaeuser Timber Co., in an address to the National Conference on State Parks. In explaining Weyerhaeuser's development of tree farm recreation areas Mr. Billings continued, "The use of my company's land for timber production, which involves watershed and soil protection as well, must come first, then, with recreational uses of this land following up in a strong second place."

The Weyerhaeuser Co.'s first recognized public park was opened in 1941, Mr. Billings said. "Hunting and fishing privileges had been granted to local sportsmen in our forest areas before this time, but the idea of maintaining a scenic recreational area and providing basic park facilities did not come until shortly before World War II.

"The number of our parks has steadily increased since that time until now, some 15 years later, we have 14 parks in Washington and Oregon. \* \* \* The 14 parks we maintain for tourists provide picnic tables, piped water, restrooms, stone and cement fireplaces, free firewood, as well as receptacles for trash. Swimming and fishing are available at 12 of the parks and overnight camping is permitted at all of them."

Mr. Billings cited the Weyerhaeuser Co's recreation policy: "Recreational opportunities shall be offered to the public through the use of designated tree farm areas for campers, hunters, fishermen, and other recreationists. \* \* \* Whenever possible, sites of historic interest or outstanding scenic beauty shall be preserved for public enjoyment. The company shall cooperate with groups interested in promoting recreational use of forest land in developing pro-

grams for the proper use of designated areas. Extending to the public the privileges of use of company lands for recreational purposes will help to achieve a better understanding and appreciation of the benefits to be derived from sound forestry management of privately owned timber lands.

#### EXHIBIT E

[From the Deseret News of December 28, 1956]

#### WHERE WILL OUR CHILDREN PLAY?

By 1975, it is generally estimated, the population of the United States will be 221 million, some 50 million more than it is today.

Time was, in the days when Malthus was believed, that this prospect would have been cause for serious economic concern. But technology has overthrown Malthus. Today we know that higher populations can mean continually higher standards of living, almost without a limit.

There is, however, one question that bothers everyone who looks to the future. It is, Where will all these people play? Will the present possibilities of getting next to nature in our woods and lakes wither away in the face of the population boom?

This question gives point to efforts to get through Congress next year laws strengthening the hand of conservation leaders in preserving fish and wildlife and recreational values in and around reclamation reservoirs.

The present Coordination Act, the National Wildlife Federation (NWF) argues, leaves important shortcomings in this respect. While it provides for studies of the effect of Federal dams on wildlife, many projects are authorized before the studies are started and partly built before studies are completed. There is nothing in the law to require modifications to meet needs discovered in the studies. Moreover, the NWF maintains, inadequate land acquisition around some Federal projects can leave the public out in the cold while chiefly benefitting land owners and speculators.

To the credit of Bureau of Reclamation and other Federal officials in this region—and we imagine the same is true elsewhere—strong efforts have been made to take care of these problems in individual projects as they have been authorized.

Land around the Wanship Reservoir-to-be, for example, has been secured and will be developed in accordance with a plan developed with the help of the National Park Service. Cabin site leases and public recreation areas will be handled by Summit County—the first time such a function has been turned over to a county in this region.

The enlarged Pineview Reservoir will be developed in a similar manner, with the exception that the Forest Service will supervise the recreational functions. Recreation at the Big Sandy project in Wyoming will be supervised by the State. The Park Service and Forest Service are jointly working out a recreation plan for major units of the Colorado River storage project.

But these precautions have been taken primarily because the men involved with them have been farsighted enough to recognize the need for more future recreation facilities, and energetic enough to secure these facilities in the individual projects. The law itself as it applies nationwide does not adequately guarantee that such facilities will be secured in all reclamation projects.

Agitation is under way to revise the Coordination Act to provide more sure protection in future development projects. This matter deserves the careful attention of western Members of Congress particularly, because of the tremendous amount of water development that this section will inevitably see during the next few years.

Meanwhile, Utah ought to lose no further time in making its own arrangements to secure adequate recreation facilities around

reservoirs and in other locations. One difficulty with the cooperative systems the Bureau of Reclamation has been trying to establish is that the State has no agency qualified to assume responsibility for this function. That is why, for example, the job has to be assumed by Summit County in the case of the Wanship Reservoir or by the Forest Service or other agencies elsewhere.

Utah badly needs a State park organization, to take care of a number of functions. Not least among them is this one. Continuing delay can only lessen the chances that future generations of Utahans will be able to find the kind of outdoor recreation that we of this generation would like our children to have.

#### INCORPORATION OF VETERANS OF WORLD WAR I

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, on behalf of my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and myself, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to grant a Federal charter of incorporation to the Veterans of World War I of the United States of America.

Mr. President, of the patriotic Americans who served our Nation in the First World War 39 years ago, 3,025,000 were living on November 30, 1956. Their average age was 62½ years. Since the time of their service, nearly four decades ago, much history has been made and other great wars have been fought. In the memory of many Americans alive today the great world war means that which we fought between 1941 and 1945, and another generation of Americans is growing up whose war-veteran husbands and brothers are those who fought for freedom and security in Korea.

Twenty-four years separate the service of the veterans of World War I from the beginning of the Second World War. Yet, many Members of the Senate, who themselves served in the first great war of our century, will understand that, to the veterans of that war, it is a memory to be held and shared in common with their contemporaries.

For that reason, many of them have decided to form among themselves the special organization known as the Veterans of World War I of the United States of America. Already this organization has over 70,000 members in all 48 States and the Territories. It has 782 barracks posts organized in 45 States.

This organization now seeks a Federal charter of incorporation to help it to bring the memory and the interests of this generation of American veterans to the attention of the American people. Federal charters have in the past been granted to such other veterans' organizations as the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Disabled American Veterans, the AMVETS, the American Legion, and the Marine Corps League. No reason is apparent to me why an organization of veterans of World War I should not be entitled to equal rights and recognition from the Congress. Accordingly, Mr. President, I ask that this bill be referred to the appropriate committee for early consideration.

The senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and I introduced a similar bill in the 84th Congress, to grant a Federal charter to the Veterans of World War I



of the United States of America, and I trust that the Congress this year will be able to act promptly and favorably on our proposal.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 848) to incorporate the Veterans of World War I of the United States of America, introduced by Mr. NEUBERGER (for himself and Mr. MORSE), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### AMENDMENTS TO NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT, AS AMENDED

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], I introduce, for appropriate reference, four bills.

These four bills are introduced as amendments to the National Labor Relations Act, as amended. All were sponsored in the 84th Congress by the Senator from Montana or myself.

We are pleased to have the junior Senator from Pennsylvania join with us in the 85th Congress as a cosponsor.

The proposed amendments are considered to be necessary in order to help make the National Labor Relations Act less biased. Briefly, the amendments would accomplish the following:

First, repeal section 9 (h) of the act, which makes leaders of organized labor second-class citizens by requiring them to make affidavit that they are not members of the Communist Party. The section has been proved both worthless and discriminatory.

Second, amend section 14 (b) of the act, which now permits States to supersede the Federal act by adopting mis-called right-to-work laws which discriminate against workers and unions involved in interstate commerce.

Third, amend the act to permit supervisors to be considered as employees under provisions of the act.

Fourth, to permit, in certain instances, secondary boycotts where a secondary employer is engaged with a primary employer in a labor dispute.

Mr. President, there has long been talk by the administration and others proposing needed changes to the National Labor Relations Act. Thus far, all we have had is talk.

I think the 85th Congress must make a concentrated effort to substitute action for the talk.

These four bills represent, I believe, an absolute minimum program for improving our basic labor-management-relations law.

The Nation cannot expect improvement in labor-management relations under a law having a built-in bias against the working men and women and their unions.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bills will be received and appropriately referred.

The bills, introduced by Mr. McNAMARA (for himself, Mr. MURRAY, and Mr. CLARK), were received, read twice by

their titles, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, as follows:

S. 856. A bill to repeal section 9 (h) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, relating to non-Communist affidavits;

S. 857. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act in order to permit supervisors to be considered as employees under the provisions of such act, and for other purposes;

S. 858. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act, as amended; and

S. 859. A bill to amend section 14 (b) of the National Labor Relations Act so as to protect the rights of employees and employers, in industries affecting commerce, to enter into union-shop agreements.

#### RELIEF TO FARMERS AND DEALERS RELATING TO CLAIMS ARISING FROM DELIVERY OF CERTAIN FEED

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to grant relief to farmers and dealers in connection with claims arising out of early and late deliveries of feed under the 1954, 1955, and 1956 emergency feed programs.

This bill, if enacted, would permit the CCC, under regulations approved by the Secretary of Agriculture, to correct a situation which has arisen in nearly all the States where emergency feed programs were in effect.

Under these programs the farmers were issued purchase orders by the FHA county committees, and were sold feed on the strength of these orders by the dealers during the emergency period; but ASC auditors subsequently determined that the dealers had not made delivery of the feed within the prescribed period, and that they were either early or late in the delivery.

The farmers and dealers in these instances were victimized by inadequate and misleading instructions from the Department of Agriculture. No adequate definitions, guides, or rules covered the problem of ineligible date deliveries while the program was in effect, and subsequently issued regulations were retrospective in application.

Mr. President, the bill, if enacted, would give the CCC the authority to grant relief to dealers and farmers who acted in good faith under the program by recognizing as valid those purchases and deliveries: First, which were actually purchased by the farmer from the dealer on or after the date the Secretary declared the county to be eligible for assistance under the emergency feed program; second, which are found to have been physically delivered to the farmer not later than 12 months from the date when the purchase order was issued to the farmer.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 860) to authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to grant relief with respect to claims arising out of deliveries of eligible surplus feed grains on ineligible dates in connection with purchase orders under its emer-

gency feed programs, introduced by Mr. ALLOTT, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

#### ASSISTANCE IN CONSTRUCTION OF PUBLIC ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOL FACILITIES

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and my colleague, the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill authorizing the appropriation of Federal assistance for public school construction, in the sum of \$1,600,000 over a period of 4 years.

It may be that provisions of this bill will be incorporated in the proposed legislation to be introduced soon on behalf of the administration, and at the request of President Eisenhower. Nevertheless, I have introduced this bill so that a number of approaches may be studied by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, of which I am a member.

I also desire to affirm my continuing interest in this field. In 1947, I was one of the four sponsors who joined with Senator Taft in the introduction of his bill to provide Federal aid for teachers and the bill was passed by the Senate.

In 1953, I introduced Senate bill 2601 to provide aid for school construction, and, while the bill secured the unanimous support of the committee, it did not come to a vote in the Senate.

I consider that aid to the States for educational purposes is a basic need and it must be provided at this session of Congress. I would hope that the opportune action of the Congress would lead to a renewed effort by the States, and at all local levels, to provide equal educational opportunities for all children, and to raise the standards of teacher training and of curricula throughout the Nation.

I appreciate very much the generous statements which were made by the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] in the course of his speech, and I commend him for bringing before the Senate many problems which attend the administration of Federal aid for school construction.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 365) to provide for Federal financial assistance to the States and Territories in the construction of public elementary and secondary school facilities, introduced by Mr. COOPER (for himself and Mr. MORTON), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

#### ADMISSION OF 10,000 REFUGEE ORPHANS TO THE UNITED STATES

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, one of the most heart-warming projects on which I ever have worked was passage of our bill, in the first session of the 84th Congress, to permit Mr. and Mrs. Harry Holt, of Creswell, Oreg., to bring into the United States eight Korean-war orphans. My greatest thrill and satisfaction since

I became a Member of the Senate occurred on October 14, 1955, at the Portland International Airport, when Harry Holt and his eight adopted Koreans arrived home. Mrs. Neuberger and I have visited the Holt home, and have seen the wonderful care which the Holt family is giving to their new children. Recently I have read the fine new book by Mrs. Holt, *Seed From the East*, which tells of their great experiences in helping others.

But the Holt family has not stopped succoring the homeless orphans of Korea. The Holt family has made many trips to Korea on behalf of these orphans, and is currently in Korea. Mr. Holt has spent almost \$100,000 of his own money in behalf of Korean orphans and in aiding other American families in their adoption of these children.

Harry Holt and his wife symbolize to me the Biblical Good Samaritan. What nobler and more unselfish deed could there be than to bring to the security and comfort of American homes children from the ravaged and tormented country of Korea?

Let me read a recent letter I have received from a family in Portland, Oreg. The letter tells of the joy and happiness brought to the family of Mr. and Mrs. William Burton, of 437 N. E. Monroe Street, by their two Korean sons:

DEAR SIR: We are writing this letter to you, to express our gratitude to the Senators and Representatives of Congress for making it possible for us to have two sons from Korea through the Refugee Act.

We are sincerely praying and hoping that a new bill be passed enabling the operation of legal adoption by proxy to continue so that other families will be blessed with children too.

My husband and I are not able to have children of our own, yet through the help of you and various others, our home has been brightened immensely and we know there are thousands of others who wish to be able to adopt some of them too.

These unfortunate, homeless children, are really our responsibility because the majority are of partial American heritage although they were not born on American soil.

Would you please help other American couples enjoy the real happiness of having those children in their homes, too?

Enclosed is a picture of our sons.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. WILLIAM BURTON.

Many of these orphans should be the direct responsibility of our people and Government, since they were fathered by American military personnel. Few children in the world have futures so bleak as those left behind in Japan and Korea by our military forces. These mixed-blood babies are not accepted; they often are mistreated and humiliated. Some are cruelly abandoned.

But the orphan problem is not solely concerned with Japan and Korea; the problem is also urgent in the Middle East, Greece, Italy, and other countries. Many American families have opened their homes to orphans from all parts of the world.

Mr. President, last year I introduced Senate bill 3753, to extend the orphan provisions of the Refugee Relief Act which expired at the end of last December, and to provide for an additional quota of 5,000 orphans. Such a pro-

posal was reported favorably by the Senate Refugee Subcommittee and the Senate Judiciary Committee. The proposed legislation passed the Senate, but unfortunately was not considered favorably by the House of Representatives.

By the failure of Congress to act, the situation concerning orphans who had been adopted by American families became desperate. With the exhaustion of the 4,000 orphan quota in the Refugee Relief Act, many families were finding it impossible to bring their recently adopted children into the United States.

To help the many families who could not bring their adopted children into our country, I wrote the Secretary of State and the Attorney General, urging immediate emergency action so these children could join their new families in our country.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my letter of October 26, 1956, to the Secretary of State, and the replies received from the Department of State and the Commissioner of Immigration, be printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,  
COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND  
INSULAR AFFAIRS,

October 26, 1956.

HON. JOHN FOSTER DULLES,

Secretary of State,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am writing to you in the hope that you can take prompt action to admit to the United States war orphans who have been adopted by American families.

The Refugee Relief Act provides that 4,000 war orphans could be admitted to the United States. This law expires at the end of the year and the orphan quotas have long since been exhausted. Many American families have adopted war orphans in the hope and expectation that their adopted children could enter our country. Now that the quotas have been exhausted, these children are not permitted to enter the United States.

In the last session of Congress, I sponsored legislation to extend and enlarge the orphan program under the Refugee Relief Act. This legislation passed the Senate in the closing hours of the session, but was not considered by the House of Representatives. I plan to reintroduce similar legislation in the next session, and I have been assured by the respective chairmen of the House and Senate Judiciary Committees that such legislation will receive prompt consideration.

Without special action on the part of your Department, these children will not be permitted to enter the United States until after Congress acts next year. These children face a bleak and uncertain future in their homelands, away from their American parents. The situation is particularly distressing for the mixed-blood orphans in Korea and Japan; another cold winter in Korea will spell death for many of these mixed-blood orphans, who were fathered by American military personnel.

Under the Immigration and Nationality Act, the Attorney General and the Secretary of State, acting jointly, may waive certain of the immigration requirements on the basis of an unforeseen emergency in individual cases, and the Attorney General may, in his discretion, parole into the United States temporarily under such conditions as he may prescribe for emergent reasons or for reasons deemed strictly in the public interest any

alien applying for admission to the United States.

I hope that you and the Attorney General will be able to take prompt action to see that these children are admitted at this time to our country. I know that you will receive the blessings of many American families for your action.

Respectfully,

RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,  
United States Senator.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,  
IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE,  
Washington, D. C., November 2, 1956.

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,  
United States Senate,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR NEUBERGER: Reference is made to your letter of October 26, 1956, requesting that action be taken to allow war orphans who have been adopted by American families entry into the United States even though the 4,000 visas authorized under the provisions of the Refugee Relief Act for orphans have been allocated.

I am pleased to advise you that a procedure has been worked out between the Immigration and Naturalization Service and the Department of State under which orphans who are eligible for visas under the provisions of section 5 of the Refugee Relief Act but who are unable to obtain visas because of unavailability of numbers will be paroled into the United States pending possible remedial legislation. Instructions were issued to the Immigration and consular officers abroad on October 30, 1956, directing them to proceed with the processing of such cases.

Sincerely,

J. M. SWING, Commissioner.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,  
Washington, November 7, 1956.

The Honorable RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,  
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR NEUBERGER: Secretary Dulles has referred to me for reply, your letter of October 26, 1956, commenting upon enlarging the orphan phase of the refugee-relief program.

Since it became known several months ago that the 4,000 visas provided for orphans by the Refugee Relief Act would be exhausted, there have been brought to the attention of the Department of State scores of cases in which orphans adopted by Americans are now unable to receive visas. The need for additional legislation has been evident for some time. In fact, the President has proposed such legislation on several occasions during the past 2 years.

Several weeks ago, at the suggestion of the President, the Department of State and the Department of Justice explored ways of permitting these orphan children to enter the United States pending further action by the Congress. I am happy to be able to tell you that, after consultation with the appropriate congressional committees, a temporary procedure has been agreed upon and, in the absence of visa numbers, eligible orphans will be admitted to the United States under the parole provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act. The particulars about these admissions will be reported to the Judiciary Committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives and, presumably, appropriate legislation will be drafted and submitted to the Congress to regularize the status of these orphans.

I am confident this will relieve the situation about which you wrote. I am enclosing a copy of a memorandum concerning the procedures, which was sent to all the Members of Congress by the Deputy Administrator of the refugee-relief program.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT C. HILL,  
Assistant Secretary.



Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, under regulations adopted by the State Department and the Attorney General's office, the emergency parole procedures of the Immigration and Nationality Act were used to allow eligible adopted orphans to enter our country and join their new parents, thus alleviating hardships which threatened many American families.

The regulations, as worked out by the Department of State and the Justice Department, provide that the adopted orphans will be able to enter our country without an immigrant visa, by being paroled to their new parents, awaiting enactment by the Congress of legislation to regularize the status of these orphans in the United States. Under current regulations of the Immigration Service, the emergency parole procedure as applied to orphans will expire at the end of this month. The Immigration Service has told me that 213 orphans have been admitted to our country under this procedure.

Mr. President, today I am introducing proposed legislation to reestablish, within the State Department, an orphan program. The bill is quite similar to the provisions of the orphan section of the Refugee Relief Act. My bill provides for a quota of 10,000 special nonquota immigrant visas, to be issued to eligible orphans until such time as the quota is exhausted. My bill also increases the age of eligible orphans from 10 years, as provided in the Refugee Relief Act, to 12 years.

The other important section of the bill would grant permanent residence in the United States for the orphans admitted under the emergency parole procedures, and these adopted orphans would thus be on the same basis as if they had been issued immigrant visas.

Mr. President, in the struggle between the Communist world and the free world, our country's symbol as a haven to the oppressed must endure. I know of no opposition to admitting to our country up to 10,000 war orphans who have been adopted by American families. While our country spends many billions of dollars in the fields of mutual aid, we can strike a blow for freedom by promptly enacting legislation admitting additional war orphans. These orphans definitely are in no danger of bringing to our country any ideologies perilous to the American traditions of freedom and liberty.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as part of my remarks, the bill I am introducing today, on behalf of myself and the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 866) authorizing the issuance of not to exceed 10,000 special nonquota immigrant visas to eligible orphans, introduced by Mr. NEUBERGER (for himself and Mr. MORSE), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the

Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 866

A bill authorizing the issuance of not to exceed 10,000 special nonquota immigrant visas to eligible orphans

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of State is authorized to issue not to exceed 10,000 special nonquota immigrant visas to eligible orphans, as defined in this act, who are under 12 years of age at the time the visa is issued; but not more than two such special nonquota immigrant visas may be issued to eligible orphans adopted abroad or to be adopted by any one United States citizen and spouse, unless necessary to prevent separation of brothers and sisters.

(b) When used in this act the term "eligible orphan" shall mean an alien child (1) who is an orphan because of the death or disappearance of both parents, or because of abandonment or desertion by, or separation or loss from, both parents, or who has only one parent due to the death or disappearance of, abandonment or desertion by, or separation or loss from the other parent and the remaining parent is incapable of providing care for such orphan and has in writing irrevocably released him for emigration and adoption; (2) (a) who has been lawfully adopted abroad by a United States citizen and spouse, or (b) for whom assurances, satisfactory to the consular officer to whom a visa application on behalf of the orphan is made, have been given by a United States citizen and spouse that if the orphan is admitted into the United States they will adopt him in the United States and will care for him properly; and (3) who is ineligible for admission into the United States solely because the nonpreference portion of the quota to which he would otherwise be chargeable is oversubscribed by applicants registered on the consular waiting list at the time his visa application is made; but no natural parent of any eligible orphan who shall be admitted into the United States pursuant to this act shall thereafter, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

(c) Any visa issued under this act to any eligible orphan who has been lawfully adopted abroad by a United States citizen and spouse while such citizen is serving abroad in the United States Armed Forces, or is employed abroad by the United States Government, or is temporarily abroad on business, shall be valid until such time as the adoptive citizen parent returns to the United States in due course of his business or service.

SEC. 2. All orphans admitted into the United States without visas prior to the enactment of this act by procedures established under section 5 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, and under the parole provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act, are hereby granted permanent residence in the United States on the same basis as if they had been issued immigrant visas.

#### INVESTIGATION OF CERTAIN MATTERS RELATING TO PETROLEUM AND PETROLEUM PRODUCTS

Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. LAUSCHE, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. SCHOEPEL, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. POTTER, Mr. PURTELL, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. COTTON) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 62), which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

Senate Resolution 62

*Resolved, etc.,* That the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134 (a) and 136 of

the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to the production for sale or use in interstate commerce, the delivery to pipelines and other interstate transportation facilities, and the transportation, distribution, and sale or use in such commerce, of petroleum products, in order that all possible steps may be taken by the Congress to—

(1) prevent serious economic dislocation with respect to such products;

(2) provide for the proper conservation and most effective use in the national interest of the petroleum resources in the United States;

(3) properly protect commerce among the several States in petroleum products; and

(4) to protect the consumers of petroleum products from the burdens and harmful effects that may be brought about, as a result of the operations and activities of any individual, partnership, association or corporation engaged in the production, refining, transportation, distribution or marketing in interstate commerce of petroleum products, or any combination of such activities.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1957, to January 31, 1958, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ, upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (3) with the prior consent to the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1958.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$50,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. MAGNUSON, subsequently, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, reported the above resolution favorably, without amendment, and it was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

#### PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF COMMITTEE PRINT ENTITLED "TAX GUIDE FOR SMALL BUSINESS"

Mr. SPARKMAN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 63), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

*Resolved,* That there be printed for the use of the Select Committee on Small Business of the Senate 10,700 additional copies of the Committee Print entitled "Tax Guide for Small Business," prepared during the 84th Congress, 2d Sess.

#### SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE PRICES OF CRUDE OIL AND PETROLEUM PRODUCTS

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], and Senators AIKEN, BEALL, CARROLL, CHAVEZ, CLARK, FLANDERS, HUMPHREY, IVES, JACKSON, JOHNSTON of South Carolina, LANGER,

LAUSCHE, MANSFIELD, MURRAY, PASTORE, POTTER, SMITH of Maine, SPARKMAN, and myself, I submit, for appropriate reference, a resolution calling for a special committee to investigate the recent increases in the price of fuel oil and gasoline.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, and that it lie on the table for other signatures until the conclusion of the session on Monday, January 23.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the resolution will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from North Carolina.

The resolution (S. Res. 64) was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, as follows:

*Resolved*, That (a) there is hereby established a special committee to be composed of 6 Senators to be appointed by the President of the Senate, of whom 3 shall be members of the majority party and 3 shall be members of the minority party.

(b) The committee is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete study and investigation for the purpose of determining—

(1) The reasons, and their justification, for recent increases in the prices of crude oil and of refined petroleum products, including, but not limited to, the effect, if any, of the recent events in Egypt and the Middle East upon domestic supplies and prices of petroleum, and

(2) Whether the enactment of legislation is necessary to provide assurance to American refiners and consumers of adequate supplies of crude oil and refined petroleum products at reasonable prices, and, if the committee determines that the enactment of legislation is necessary, what legislation would be most likely to provide such assurance.

Sec. 2. The committee shall, at its first meeting, to be called by the President of the Senate, select a chairman and vice chairman from among its members. Any vacancy in the committee shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment.

Sec. 3. (a) For the purposes of this resolution the committee is authorized to (1) hold such hearings; (2) sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate; (3) require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents; (4) administer such oaths; (5) take such testimony either orally or by deposition; (6) employ on a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants, and, with the prior consent of the executive department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, employ on a reimbursable basis such executive branch personnel, as it deems advisable.

(b) A quorum of the committee shall consist of three members, except that the committee may provide that, for the purpose of taking testimony, 2 members, 1 from the majority party and 1 from the minority party, shall constitute a quorum.

Sec. 4. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed \$50,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Sec. 5. (a) The committee shall report the results of its study and investigation, together with such recommendations as it may deem advisable, to the Senate not later than June 30, 1957.

(b) Upon the filing of its report, the committee shall cease to exist.

Mr. HENNINGS, from the Committee on Rules and Administration reported favorably original resolutions numbered 65 through 72, which were placed on the calendar.

(See the above resolutions printed in full which appear under the heading "Reports of Committees" in Senate proceedings of today.)

#### HOME LOANS TO VETERANS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the names of Senators CHURCH, JACKSON, MCCARTHY, JENNER, CARROLL, and ERVIN be added as cosponsors to S. 726, the veterans' home loan bill which I introduced on January 17, 1947, and that at the next printing of the bill their names be included.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### AMENDMENT OF ROBINSON-PATMAN ACT WITH REFERENCE TO EQUALITY OF OPPORTUNITY—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] may be added as an additional cosponsor of the bill (S. 11) to amend the Robinson-Patman Act with reference to equality of opportunity, introduced by me, for myself and other Senators, on January 7, 1957.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE TO AMERICAN INDIANS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], one of the great fighters for the improvement of the way of life of the American Indian, has joined in cosponsoring S. 809, introduced by me on Wednesday. The bill will provide \$200 million to bring industries in or near Indian reservations, provide employment for the Indians, and aid the economy of the Indian people. I am very grateful to the Senator from New Mexico for joining in sponsoring this very worthwhile bill. We plan to hold hearings on it very soon.

#### ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

Address delivered by him today at the Industrial College of the Armed Forces, on the subject Small Business and National Security.

By Mr. JENNER:

Statement by him regarding the President's message on the state of the Union.

#### NOTICE OF HEARING IN NOMINATION OF CHRISTIAN A. HERTER TO BE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I desire to announce that the Senate received today from the President of the United States the nomination of Christian A. Herter, of Massachusetts, to be Under Secretary of State, vice Herbert Hoover, Jr., resigned.

Notice is given that this nomination will be eligible for consideration by the Committee on Foreign Relations at the expiration of 6 days, in accordance with the committee rule.

#### NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 38

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I desire to give notice that public hearings will be held by the Subcommittee on Housing of the Committee on Banking and Currency on Senate Joint Resolution 38. The purpose of the resolution is to amend and revise the National Housing Act provisions governing the Federal National Mortgage Association. The hearings will begin on Wednesday, February 6, 1957, at 10 a. m., in room 301, Senate Office Building.

All persons who desire to appear and testify at the hearings are requested to notify Mr. Jack Carter, staff director, Senate Subcommittee on Housing, 15-A Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C., telephone National 8-3120, extension 2179, as soon as possible, and, in any event, before the close of business on Friday, February 1, 1957.

#### DEFINITION AND PROTECTION OF CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, on the 21st of this month I submitted an amendment to the bill (S. 83) to provide means of further securing and protecting the civil rights of persons within the jurisdiction of the United States which was printed in the RECORD. At this time I ask unanimous consent that remarks I have prepared on the amendment be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks, and that a copy of the amendment be printed at the end of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement and amendment were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR GOLDWATER

S. 83, a bill introduced into this body by a large group of Senators, has, as its purpose, the definition and protection of civil rights. I am heartily in accord with the intent of this legislation, and I will ask to be included as a cosponsor of it so that I may better aid in its passage. But, Mr. President, the framers of this bill have forgotten one of the most precious of all rights, namely, the right to work. S. 83 proposes that the national policy protect the right of the individual to be free from discrimination on account of race, color, religion, or national origin. It should have included the protection of the individual from discrimination on account of belonging or not belonging to a labor organization.



Mr. President, after the Constitution was written, those wise men who had labored on that document decided that even though the source of our concepts of freedom is God, the day could come when those rights, even though inherent, might be encroached upon if they were not spelled out. The result of this fear was the Bill of Rights—the first 10 amendments to the Constitution in which many of our rights are carefully outlined. The forgotten ninth amendment even went so far as to say: "The enumeration in the Constitution of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people." We can see then that the Constitution is clear in its intent to protect all of our inherent rights and the right to work is one of these. It is not spelled out in the Constitution—nor is it recognized by amendment, like the right to vote regardless of one's sex. Neither does the Constitution set forth the right to eat or sleep—these actions are part of our daily lives—a part of life itself and therefore they needed no defining. They are God-given rights that are inherent and the right to life is one of them. Remember the words of the Declaration of Independence: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, and that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

The right to life is so basic as to create no argument, but how can the right to life be exercised when the right to work is tampered with? Here is what the Supreme Court said in *Butchers Union v. Crescent City, Ill.* (U. S. 746). "The right to follow any of the common occupations of life is an inalienable right. To deny it is what no legislature has a right to do; and no contract to that end can be binding on subsequent legislatures." That was the Supreme Court speaking. Now let's take a look at what one of the great liberals of our time said about this. I refer to the late President Franklin Roosevelt.

"I tell you frankly that the Government of the United States will not order, nor will Congress pass, legislation ordering a so-called closed shop. It is true that by agreement in many plants of various industries the closed shop is now in operation. This is a result of the legal collective bargaining and not of Government compulsion on employers or employees. It is also true that 95 percent or more of the employees in these particular mines belong to the United Mine Workers Union. The Government will never compel this 5 percent to join the union by Government decree. That would be too much like the Hitler methods toward labor."

Further, let's hear what one of the most distinguished of our modern day liberals said about this subject on January 9 of this year. I refer to the junior Senator from Minnesota, HUBERT HUMPHREY, whose enthusiasm for the enactment of a proper civil-rights measure will be a credit to him throughout his life.

"By civil rights we mean the personal, political, and economic rights and privileges guaranteed under the Constitution and the law, and implicit in the democratic way of life—rights and privileges which are morally the heritage of every human being, regardless of his membership in any ethnic group. To be specific, I believe these rights include the right to work, the right to education, the right to housing, the right to the use of public accommodations, of health and welfare services and facilities, and the right to live in peace and dignity without discrimination, segregation, or distinction based on race, religion, color, ancestry, national origin, or place of birth. These are the rights and privileges without which no individual can participate freely or completely in our democratic society. These are the rights which government has the duty to defend and expand."

Mr. President, there is much agreement that among our civil rights is the right to work. Frankly, I believe it to be among our most cherished inherent and civil rights.

I will be charged by some extreme members of the liberal bloc in this country and by some of our labor leaders that my only interest in introducing my amendment is to prevent the passage of the entire civil-rights measure. This is not true, Mr. President. I would remind my colleagues that I have maintained a stand against the abuse of civil rights for my entire life. I worked against segregation in the schools of my State; as chief of staff for air in the National Guard of my State, I opened up our Air Guard to people of all colors, race, or national origin.

Mr. President, instead of preaching about it, I have been practicing my antipathy toward discrimination in any form.

Let me remind the extremists that swept under their carpet is the fact that Negro bricklayers in Milwaukee have been denied membership in a union because of their color; let me remind them also that included in the constitution of two unions are requirements that an applicant be white born.

No, Mr. President; my intentions in introducing an amendment to S. 83 are not to wreck unions nor impair their actions, but to make sure that when we in this body outline, define, and protect civil rights we do a thorough and proper job. Let us not try to escape our responsibilities in this field. Let us recognize that a basic inherent and civil right has been and is being tampered with, and let us by our actions call a halt to that tampering.

On page 11 strike out lines 3 through 8 and insert the following:

"(1) Investigate written allegations that certain citizens of the United States are being deprived of their rights to vote or obtain employment, or are being subjected to unwarranted economic pressures, by reason of their color, race, religion, national origin, or membership or nonmembership in a labor or trade organization."

### THIRTY-NINTH ANNIVERSARY OF INDEPENDENCE OF UKRAINE

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, January 22 marked the 39th anniversary of the independence of Ukraine, the real and genuine independence that was declared in 1918 with the formation of the sovereign Ukrainian National Republic. This anniversary is being observed throughout this land and in other parts of the free world. I join with countless Americans in paying tribute to the patriotic will of the Ukrainian people and nation which was clearly expressed to the world 39 years ago and which continues to express itself in the stubborn and courageous resistance of the Ukraine to the Communist imperialism and colonialism of Moscow.

Rich in resources and strategic in geographical location, Ukraine has been the prime object of Russian Communist imperialism and colonialism these past 36 years. Nowhere, perhaps, is the issue of imperialism and colonialism in our day more real and pertinent than in this rich area of Eastern Europe. Those who are wont to apply this issue to other parts of the world, might well study the record of the Ukraine's subjugation by Russian Communist colonialism and begin to recognize the true applications of this issue. Moscow's colonialism and imperialism are unparalleled in recorded history. And the Ukrainian people, who have had

the longest experience with this criminal and barbaric brand of colonialism that would seek even to obliterate national entities for its own exploiting purposes, know this perhaps best.

Mr. President, in our own interest as well as theirs, we must do everything possible to support the will and hope of the 40 million Ukrainians for their national independence and true sovereignty. I declare my support of the proposal to proclaim January 22 of each year as Ukrainian Independence Day. This would be the beacon of America's hope for a free and independent Ukraine.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, January 22 marked the 39th anniversary of Ukrainian independence.

For too many years, the observance of this anniversary has had an unhappy hollow ring, as the Soviets kept their iron fist on the spirit of freedom in Ukraine and other captured nations.

In the past year, however, we have begun to see the cracks in this domination—cracks that were bound to develop as the freedom spirit rose above even the most brutal Communist oppression.

The honor roll of freedom fighters is long—Hungary, Poland, and East Berlin, to name a few.

While these gallant uprisings against Communist tyranny have captured the headlines, the fight for freedom in the Ukraine continues.

Prisoners in a Russian slave-labor camp revolt. A Communist troop train is blown up. Public protests against Communist domination appear.

These are all signs of the times, and are a prelude to better times, when the Ukraine and the other nations again will have their independence.

### OPEN LETTER FROM GEORGE TODT TO VICTOR RIESEL

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a column under the heading "George Todt's Opinion," published in the Valley Times, of California, for January 21, 1957. I wish to state that I especially concur in the praise accorded by Mr. Todt to my colleague, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER]. He is one of the valued Members of this body, whose courage and ability mean a great deal to our country.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### GEORGE TODT'S OPINION

##### AS ONE COLUMNIST WRITES ANOTHER

"Those who never retract their opinions love themselves more than they love truth." (Joubert.)

This column is an open letter to columnist Victor Riesel:

DEAR VICTOR: As you already know, you're a columnist's columnist—and certainly a favorite of mine. I, among many, have come to rely on your integrity in giving the American people such a clear-cut picture of what has been going on behind the scenes in the labor movement today, and I am frank to say that I believe you to be the best informed journalist in this particular field inside the U. S. A.

You've done a lot of good, Vic. Your rugged crusading courage has exposed the

bad along with the good in the organized labor movement, and because of this we shall have improvements—which are badly needed—in the future. When your personal tragedy occurred last year, I believe you will recall, I was in the front ranks of your contemporaries in the fourth estate who responded all out in your behalf.

I mention this as background to indicate that, as you must understand, I approve, in the main, of what you have done in the past, and have only the friendliest feelings toward you as an accomplished writer and gentleman. Nevertheless, I had occasion to disagree with you recently in a vital area of the labor movement, and I want to discuss it with you at this time. It concerns what, in my opinion, is the heart of the problem involved for the citizens of our Nation now, and increasingly in the future. It is the question of arbitrary negation of an American's citizenship rights to compel him to join a union in order to earn a livelihood for himself and his family—without which freedom and liberty are words without true meaning.

In a recent column, you wrote, in part, as follows: "Traditionally the GOP national high command shuts up desk and shop after each election. This time the labor section was not mothballed. Labor Secretary James Mitchell believes that much of labor's vote was successfully wooed over the pitch of the national union chiefs—virtually all of whom were for Adlai Stevenson. Mitchell is reported to believe that this success was due to the White House refusal to attack all labor sweepingly, as has been the practice of many Republican strategists in the past—and some Republicans, such as Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, at present."

Now, Vic, let's set the record straight at this point. I know BARRY GOLDWATER as well as you do, and we both know that he has never attacked labor sweepingly, at any time in his career. I would like to know of even one instance where he may have done so. If you will be good enough to supply me with the time, place, and what was said by the Senator that could reasonably be considered to attack all labor sweepingly—I will print it forthwith for my readers to see for themselves. In the absence of any such specific data, however, I believe they should not hold the Arizona solon responsible for something I don't believe he has ever done, i. e., attack all labor sweepingly.

What Mr. GOLDWATER has done in the past is merely to champion basic American principles which are bound up within the scope and meaning of the Bill of Rights, and the spirit of the Declaration of Independence, and the Constitution, itself. In particular he has fought for the right-to-work law—which means that no man should be deprived of his job by reason of having joined, or not having joined, a union. Can anyone point out any instance in any of the 18 States which have adopted right-to-work laws where any workman has been prevented from joining a union of his choice? The answer to this is bound up in the fact that union membership has increased, not decreased, in the States which adopted right-to-work laws.

It is true that Mr. GOLDWATER has fought against corruption and abuse of union members by gangsters and racketeers inside the labor movement—but so have you, Vic. Both of you have been tremendously effective in leveling your guns at the vicious culprits inside the labor movement who have engaged in labor racketeering, violence, and intimidation of the honest rank and file membership. Each of you have called for congressional investigation of this criminal phase of activity inside labor. But does this constitute any sweeping attack on labor by either one or both of you? Of course it does not. And it is the rank and file of union membership who appreciate the most what men like you and

Senator GOLDWATER are doing in their behalf. More power to you—and to the Senate investigation which is coming off this month. And let the chips fall where they may.

Oh, yes—one thing more. It is true that Senator GOLDWATER has attacked the abnormal political ambitions of one Walter Reuther—the darling of the Americans For Democratic Action and the World Federalists. In fact, he has attacked him manfully with a two-fisted frontal attack to which Mr. Reuther, curiously, seems to have little stomach to reply.

I feel sure you will agree with me that an attack on Socialistic Walter Reuther, in particular, constitutes no sweeping attack on all labor—or does it? For if Mr. Reuther is the personification of all labor today, that in itself represents one of the most compelling arguments in favor of right to work laws in every State. Can his background stand inspection? How many real Americans want to be under Mr. Reuther now or in the future? Shouldn't they have a choice in the matter?

Sincerely,

GEORGE TODT.

#### CHRIS MILIUS

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, Nebraska is losing, by retirement, the services of one of our outstanding farm leaders. He has served well in Nebraska and in the Nation. I refer to Mr. Chris Milius, who has been a member of the Secretary of Agriculture's Advisory Board.

I ask unanimous consent that I may have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks an article written by Chris Milius on January 9, 1957, which shows the very sound and patriotic philosophy of this most distinguished Nebraskan.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Nebraska Union Farmer of January 9, 1957]

#### THE OPPORTUNITY IS OURS

The State of Nebraska and the Federal lawmakers are in session to pass or reject many bills which may be introduced and to appropriate money to carry on existing government as well as provide money for new bureaus, boards or commissions which may be approved.

As we approach our State capitol, we see carved above the door: "The Salvation of the State is Watchfulness in the Citizen."

We must not hold our privileges lightly and we must regard our obligations very seriously. One sometimes wonders if the Founding Fathers comprehended just what opportunities they were giving us and also what challenge they threw to make the most of these opportunities for ourselves and for future generations.

Isn't it our duty as citizens to make a maximum contribution to keep government and taxation within the people's ability to pay? We are the trustees; may we preserve our responsibility.

High tax rates become ineffective when wealth is dissipated. Isn't it our duty to help provide an opportunity state instead of a welfare state?

Some people think they are getting even with those of wealth by placing these tax burdens upon them, but in reality they are placing a crushing burden upon themselves and an even more severe one upon our children. We are destroying the magnificent heritage received from our fathers. Unless the trend is changed, we are condemning our descendants to misery and want as the increase in taxation can go so far as to confiscate private property.

The men who first planned our constitutional government were convinced that freedom was possible only under a government that protected private property; and therefore, they sought to construct a limited government which would be so checked that it could not confiscate its citizens' wealth.

Are we coming to the point of thinking where the principles laid down by the framers of the Constitution are outmoded—when they had in mind a document for people to protect their inalienable rights to life, liberty and property, and whose primary purpose is to insure freedom.

We are confronted with a compulsory and unnatural system of the totalitarian state advanced by men to achieve their own selfish ends. We often hear the view expressed: "Yes, it is voluntary; but, if you don't do it voluntarily, they want and ask for power to force you to do it."

The state should protect the freedom of its citizens—not become their master nor absorb the citizen or family. Both should be allowed free and untrammelled action so far as is consistent with the common good and the interest of others. Unless sound reason prevails to guide the groping footsteps of those endeavoring to escape from present well-nigh intolerable conditions, the efforts of our forefathers—whose self-reliance, individual initiative and hard work enabled them to save the money which built a strong Nation—can be undone.

CHRIS MILIUS.

#### CLOTHING CONTRACTS AWARDED BY ARMY

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 2 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Arkansas may proceed.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations is presently conducting a preliminary inquiry in the matter concerning Robert Tripp Ross, now on leave of absence as Assistant Secretary of Defense.

This inquiry began on January 4, 1957, as a result of newspaper stories which revealed that Mr. Ross' wife was president of Wynn Enterprises, Inc., which had just received a clothing contract from the Army. It was also revealed at that time that the brother-in-law of Mr. Ross, namely, Herman D. Wynn, operated several companies in the clothing manufacturing field and that these companies had received numerous Government contracts.

Because of the implication in these stories of a possible conflict of interests on the part of Mr. Ross, this subcommittee, on January 4, requested that the Defense Department furnish for review the documents dealing with the contracts which had been awarded to Wynn Enterprises, Inc., since 1951.

On January 12, we again specifically asked the Defense Department for all contracts awarded to Herman D. Wynn or any other companies with which he is or had been affiliated.

It has been my feeling that, in fairness to Mr. Ross, this investigation should be handled as expeditiously as possible. Those were the instructions given to the staff of the subcommittee. I can tell the Senate it has been my firm intention to conduct an expeditious in-



vestigation; but, unfortunately, we have encountered considerable delays, and these delays, I am sorry to report, have come from the Department of Defense and the military services, including the Army.

First, they have told us that we will not have the material on the Wynn Enterprises, Inc., until January 25 or January 28. Within the last few days we have been informed that they will not be able to furnish the rest of the contracts until February 8. And thus, Mr. President, it will not be until February 8, more than 2 weeks from now, that the staff of the subcommittee will be able even to commence a part of its study.

We have attempted to have the Department of Defense expedite the handling of this matter, but so far it has not provided the material requested. I think it is my duty to make this statement, since there is interest in this issue. The press and the public are inquiring about it, but we cannot expedite the investigation until we obtain the material requested. It is not the fault of the committee that we have not moved faster.

Mr. Ross has taken leave of absence until the congressional inquiry is completed. I make this statement because some time has already elapsed, and future delays are indicated. I felt that we should point out that Mr. Ross' present position, on leave of absence, is due not to the Congress, but to delays which are occurring within the Department of Defense.

#### INVESTIGATION OF RECENT INCREASES IN PRICES OF PETROLEUM PRODUCTS

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 6 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Rhode Island may proceed.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I wholeheartedly join the distinguished junior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SCOTT] in sponsoring his resolution to create a special committee to investigate the recent increases in the price of fuel oil and gasoline. It is a job which must be done—and done quickly—in the interest of oil consumers everywhere in this country.

I congratulate my distinguished colleague for his interest in this problem and his determination to have a full-scale investigation promptly conducted in order to prevent oil and gasoline consumers from being gouged by profit seekers in the oil industry who are apparently taking advantage of a world situation at the expense of the American consumer.

While I recognize that this resolution provides for the creation of a special committee, I do not preclude or question the competence of any one of our standing committees, whose jurisdiction may cover this matter, to deal with it if the Senate so decides. My chief concern is with the substance and not the jurisdiction of this problem. What committee does the job is of little importance, but

it is very important that the job be done thoroughly and expeditiously.

In view of the President's admonition in his state of the Union message against unwarranted price increases, there is every reason for the Federal Trade Commission and the Department of Justice—both of whom have jurisdiction over anti-trust problems—to undertake immediately an investigation on their own. This is a big subject, having many ramifications and involving tremendous amounts of money and we should employ all the trained personnel and manpower at our disposal in order to protect the consumer's interest.

The reason I say this, Mr. President, is that during the past 10 days this matter of price increases in the cost of fuel oil, gasoline, and other petroleum products, has been called to the attention of the Senate by a number of my colleagues. Protests are coming in to every Senator's office from all over the country. It is not a regional problem. It affects every State because I believe it is a direct assault upon the consumers of our Nation.

I am in receipt of a letter under date of January 15 from a spokesman for a number of oil dealers in the State of Rhode Island, which graphically points out the growing volume of protests by small-business men as well as consumers who have been adversely affected by these recent oil price increases. In this connection, I ask unanimous consent to have this letter and the attachment printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter and attachment were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KEYSTONE OIL & COAL CO., INC.,  
Providence, R. I., January 15, 1956.

Senator JOHN O. PASTORE,  
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR PASTORE: This is to confirm our short conversation on Sunday, January 13, about oil prices.

I have discussed the recent price rise of 1 cent per gallon with several dealers, and they all feel that the increase is too high and unnecessary.

This increase will cause great hardship among the smaller dealers in the industry (2 to 7 truck operators), for this is a credit business, and the excessive cost of carrying accounts will put some dealers out of business.

An organization called the Oil Heat Committee of Rhode Island spent \$69,558 for advertising during the past 2 years. This was done on a cooperative basis. Now this program is useless, due to the increase in the price of heating oils.

Any help that you can give us will be greatly appreciated.

Attached is a list of oil dealers that feel something should be done to remedy this situation.

Very truly yours,

KEYSTONE OIL & COAL CO., INC.,  
FRANK LANCIA, President.

#### LIST OF DEALERS

Keystone Oil & Coal Co., Inc., Olean Fuel & Appliance Co., L & I Oil Service, Philip Fogarty & Sons, Galego Oil Co., Rocchio Oil Service, White Fuel Co., Hartford Oil Co., Mohawk Oil Co., Johnny's Oil Service, Palmisano's Oil Co., Mathew's Oil Service.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I am deeply impressed by the fact that reliable sources state that there is no basic justification for these price increases on the

part of the oil industry. I view the situation as alarming and in direct conflict with the recent forthright admonition of the President in his state of the Union message when he said:

Business leaders must, in the national interest, studiously avoid those price rises that are possible only because of vital or unusual needs of the whole Nation.

The Suez crisis is said by the oil industry to be the reason for the price increases, but according to a recent industry report of the American petroleum industry published in the Wall Street Journal on January 11, our gasoline stocks now exceed 186 million barrels, or 17 million barrels more than a year ago. Likewise, in the New York Times, on the same date, January 11, it was reported that light fuel oil used in heating homes is in abundant supply, with our reserve stocks of 132 million barrels exceeding by 25 million barrels our reserves of last year. The New York Times goes on to state that reserve supplies of heavy fuel oil amount to more than 42 million barrels, which exceeds by 3 million barrels the supply of a year ago.

These facts, coupled with the recent action of the Texas Railroad Commission in reducing allowable monthly production days from 16 in January to 15 in February, as pointed out in an editorial that appeared in the Washington Post on January 22, gives rise to the growing suspicion that consumers are being victimized by deliberate price gouging. I note that this is the flat position of the National Oil Marketers Association, which represents a great number of independent oil jobbers.

I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial entitled "Oil Squeeze in Texas," published in the Washington Post of January 22, 1957, printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post and Times  
Herald of January 22, 1957]

#### OIL SQUEEZE IN TEXAS

The behavior of the Texas Railroad Commission, which regulates oil production in Texas, is surely becoming curiouse and curiouse. In the face of a rising world demand for crude oil, the commission ordered a production cutback last week. It is true that the commission raised daily output limits slightly, but it simultaneously trimmed allowable monthly production days from 16 to 15, meaning that the February output limit is 3.5 percent lower than this month's limit. All this takes place at a time when Western Europe is much more dependent on American oil because of the Suez stoppage.

What kind of game are the oilmen playing? Recent crude oil price increases have been blamed on Suez, yet it may well seem, particularly to the British, that Texas producers have a responsibility along with Colonel Nasser. (Some 45 percent of all domestic oil is produced in Texas.) The railroad commission's ruling does little to still that suspicion. It has been a matter of record that independent Texas oilmen have clamored for lower production quotas in the hopes of getting their long-sought crude oil price increase—which they now have obtained.

In addition, the Suez crisis is also being blamed for gasoline price increases that all of us will pay. Here the situation is even more curious because there is presently a

glut of American gasoline. As of January 11, the American Petroleum Institute reported gasoline stocks of 189.2 million barrels as against a backlog of 171.9 million a year before. (This gasoline surplus offers little overseas relief since Europe wants crude oil which can be refined abroad, saving dollar reserves.) It is little wonder that the oil price increases are stirring congressional attention and a Justice Department probe.

The public is surely entitled to know more about oil economics—Texas style.

Mr. PASTORE. My State is largely dependent upon oil for its industry and home heating. The situation becomes all the more aggravated when we consider that this has been an unusually cold winter. These people are powerless to combat any price increase which the oil industry indiscriminately and without justification chooses to pass on to them. For all practical purposes, these consumers are captives of the oil industry, which seems to be taking advantage of an unusual world situation in order to squeeze out of consumers' pocketbooks the last full measure of profit.

The impact of even a 1 cent a gallon increase upon oil consumers throughout this Nation is no small matter. According to the New York Times of Sunday, January 6, such an increase means an added cost to our Nation's oil and gasoline consumers of about \$3,150,000 a day, or \$1,150,000,000 a year. This subject, therefore, does not involve small figures. In my view they are staggering and prompt me to challenge the necessity of such an added expense to the already heavily burdened pocketbook of the average consumer.

I understand that on January 11, the president of the American Automobile Association, Mr. Harry I. Kirk, sent telegrams to the major oil companies asking for the justification, if any, of the price increase and, thus far, has received no satisfactory explanation. The American Automobile Association pointed out that with gasoline reserve stocks rising and far in excess of last year's averages, the ordinary laws of supply and demand would seem to require a gasoline price decrease rather than an increase.

In the light of this paradox the American Automobile Association is vigorously challenging the necessity for the added charge being passed on to gasoline consumers throughout the Nation.

Furthermore, Mr. President, the Wall Street Journal for January 21 contains a report that our crude oil imports are continuing at near record levels at the very time European nations are crying for crude oil. The figures for the week ending January 11 indicate imports of 1,682,900 barrels a day. So—taken as a whole, this picture is very confusing indeed and the facts appearing on the surface, at least, are sufficient to justify the public demand for putting the searchlight of scrutiny on oil economics generally and particularly on this matter of price increases.

I have no idea as to what the executive branch of our Government is doing in giving meaning to the President's admonition against these unnecessary price increases which have been prompted only because of an unusual world situation. But I do know, Mr. President, that the

Congress of the United States has a definite and direct responsibility to the consumers of this Nation in protecting them from unwarranted price gouging.

This whole situation, Mr. President, cries out for our immediate attention, and it is my fervent hope, therefore, that within a matter of days, a full-scale investigation will be initiated by an appropriate committee of the Senate to the end that the oil consumers and the small and independent businessmen interested in the oil industry will be protected.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. First I wish to thank the Senator, and associate myself with his remarks, as I have done with respect to the remarks of other colleagues on this particular subject.

I mention this to the Senator because it was my privilege, as a member of the Small Business Committee last year, to conduct some hearings with respect to the petroleum industry. At that time we made a recommendation to the Federal Trade Commission to look into the pricing practices of the petroleum industry. I introduced a resolution at that time asking for an appropriation to supplement the Federal Trade Commission appropriation, so that additional staff members could be employed.

While I wish to see this investigation proceed in terms of congressional activity, the Federal Trade Commission has a responsibility under the law to check into this very development. It has a particular responsibility because of the authorization under which it operates. Because of the competence of its staff and its technical services, it is peculiarly well equipped to do this job.

Mr. PASTORE. I quite agree with the Senator.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Rhode Island has expired.

Mr. LANGER. For the information of the Senator from Rhode Island, let me say that the Senate Committee on the Judiciary has appointed the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] to be chairman of the subcommittee to conduct this investigation. The senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] are also members of the subcommittee.

Mr. PASTORE. I care not who does the job, but I want to see it done.

#### RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY MILWAUKEE CIO, PROTESTING INCREASES IN OIL AND GAS PRICES

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk the text of a resolution which I received this morning from the Milwaukee County Industrial Union Council, AFL-CIO, protesting against the considerable increases in the price of oil and gasoline.

As stated by the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], I, with the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN],

have been appointed to serve on the committee which will investigate matters relative to this subject, and shall be happy to cooperate with them.

I believe the resolution to which I have referred makes a most important point, namely, that the consumers of the United States are entitled to get the facts concerning this situation.

We are entitled to know why, with America's gasoline stocks amounting to 189 million barrels, which is more than 18 million barrels larger than a year ago, and when there is definitely no gasoline shortage in the United States, prices should be rising instead of being held relatively stationary.

The fact is, however, that the price of the motorist's gasoline is going up, as well as the price of home heating oil, kerosene, diesel fuel, and other varieties of petroleum products.

We all realize that we are in a relatively inflationary age. We realize that costs have gone up in virtually every industry. We believe that all industries are entitled to a fair return on their investment.

But we also believe that citizens are entitled to know whether they are being subjected to a price gouge.

For that reason, I am pleased that the Antimonopoly Subcommittee is, indeed, going to study this problem.

The study should be fair and the chips should fall where they may.

Obviously, there are important international implications to this whole subject, especially in view of the fact that Europe has such a sizable need for American oil because of the blocking of the Suez Canal.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the resolution, as forwarded by Mr. Fred A. Erchul, secretary-treasurer of the Milwaukee County Industrial Union Council, AFL-CIO, be printed at this point in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, to be followed thereafter by the text of an editorial from the Tuesday, January 15, issue of the Milwaukee Journal on this same subject—one of several clippings which Mr. Erchul had kindly conveyed.

There being no objection, the resolution and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MILWAUKEE COUNTY INDUSTRIAL UNION COUNCIL, AFL-CIO,  
Milwaukee, Wis., January 21, 1957.  
Senator ALEXANDER H. WILEY,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: The Milwaukee County Industrial Union Council, AFL-CIO, at their regular council delegate meeting January 16, went on record unanimously approving the following resolution:

"Whereas a number of oil companies have announced they are increasing the price of gasoline; and

"Whereas the main reason stated by the oil companies for said increase is the Suez Canal crisis; and

"Whereas the Suez Canal crisis is creating a European shortage of crude oil and has therefore caused an increase of American export of crude oil to Europe; and

"Whereas the production of a gallon of crude oil produces also a gallon of gasoline, which it is reported is creating a surplus of gasoline in America; and



"Whereas with such apparent surplus, the oil companies have announced an increase of gasoline cost by 1 cent a gallon: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the Milwaukee County Industrial Union Council protest this apparent consumer price gouge by the oil companies and submit our protest to Senators WILEY and McCARTHY and Congressmen REUSS and ZABLOCKI, requesting them to demand a congressional investigation into this gasoline price increase."

Enclosed for your information are clippings from the Milwaukee Journal relative to the matter.

The council urges you to give this matter your most sincere consideration and study to the end that these consumer price gouges by the oil companies will cease.

Very truly yours,

FRED A. ERCHUL,  
Secretary-Treasurer, Milwaukee  
County Industrial Union Council, AFL-CIO.

[From the Milwaukee Journal of January 15, 1957]

#### MORE GASOLINE, HIGHER PRICE?

More about the boost in gasoline prices, which, as already suggested, has all the looks of a consumer gouge.

This is from the January 4 issue of U. S. News & World Report:

"The American motorist may be blessed in 1957 with an abundance of gasoline so great as to force prices down."

Here's the story, summarized, that the magazine tells:

There was a gasoline surplus in this country in 1956. Stocks climbed about 10 percent during the year. As a result of the Suez blockade, Western Europe is importing petroleum products from this country. But it is importing mostly crude and fuel oil, not gasoline. When United States refineries break down crude oil to produce fuel oil for Europe, they add to the gasoline surplus because, on an average, more than a gallon of gasoline is turned out with every gallon of fuel oil.

"So," explains the magazine, "as fuel oil flows abroad in larger amounts, gasoline stocks here at home are likely to increase, the industry believes."

And it ends the article, after explaining that European demands for oil provide a problem to the American oil industry, with these words:

"Indirectly, these demands open up the prospect of cheaper, more abundant gasoline for the American motorist—at a time when the European motorist is being rationed."

This whole odd oil price business brings to mind the following warning in President Eisenhower's state of the Union message:

"The national interest must take precedence over temporary advantages which may be secured by particular groups at the expense of all the people. In this regard I urge leaders in business and in labor to think well on their responsibility to all the American people. With all elements of our society, they owe the Nation a vigilant guard against the inflationary tendencies that are always at work in a dynamic economy operating at today's high levels. They can powerfully help counteract or accentuate such tendencies by their wage and price policies. Business in its pricing policies should avoid unnecessary price increases. . . ."

Is the oil industry heeding the President's warning? If so, explanations as to how are in order.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, the American productive know-how is world famous.

As the standard of living and the demand for goods increases our great industries find new and better ways to increase production and to improve the product.

According to an old economic theory, increased demand, increased production, and more know-how in manufacture result in lower prices.

Apparently, however, this theory is as phony as the Cardiff giant.

I can only draw this conclusion from the penny-a-gallon price increase on gasoline imposed by the oil industry.

Here is what appears to be another classic example of price gouging—a field in which this industry has excelled for years.

I wish to go on record as supporting an investigation into this situation.

Perhaps we will discover that the oil industry needs this increase—if only to pay its lobbying costs.

Mr. President, Mr. Harry I. Kirk, president of the American Automobile Association, recently sent a telegram to the presidents of 16 major oil companies demanding justification for the price increase.

I ask unanimous consent that this telegram, dated January 11, 1957, be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The American Automobile Association, concerned over the increasing cost of car operation, has questioned the justification of a gasoline price rise. In a telegram to the presidents of 16 major oil companies which market gasoline in the States east of the Rockies, AAA President Harry I. Kirk said: "Reports of an increase of 1 cent a gallon on gasoline east of the Rockies raise a serious question in the minds of motorists as to the justification for this action, in view of the more than ample stocks on hand and the relatively lower winter consumption of gasoline. The oil industry's own statistics show that nearly 187 million barrels of gasoline are on hand, which exceeds last year's inventory by almost 18 million barrels. This is about a 60-day supply under normal conditions. A 30-day supply is normal. Moreover, stocks are rising; last week they went up nearly a million barrels. The facts indicate a decrease, rather than an increase, in gasoline prices if the law of supply and demand were applied. If there is some justification for raising gasoline prices, of which we are not aware, we should appreciate knowing about it. Otherwise we must oppose the price increase."

#### THE PRESIDENT'S MIDDLE EAST PROPOSAL

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, it has been my judgment from the outset of the discussion of President Eisenhower's Middle East proposal that Congress would overwhelmingly approve the President's request for necessary authority. It has been my judgment that Congress would do so, because there is no actual alternative to action by the Congress signifying to the Kremlin that we will not tolerate aggression in this crucial area of the globe.

The record of history proves that the danger of war intensifies not when we

are strong and serve clear warning to an aggressor, but when we are weak and indecisive and fail to notify an aggressor of our determination to counter his plans.

This fact was masterfully brought out in a recent article by the eminent columnist, David Lawrence.

He cited instance after instance throughout history to prove the point.

We might well bear in mind these facts as the Senate Foreign Relations and Armed Services Committees continue their review of this problem.

The headlines of any particular day's news from Capitol Hill may seem to indicate that the President's bill is allegedly foundering. In my judgment, however, despite surface appearances to the contrary, it is still relatively certain that the Senate, like the House, will recognize its nonpartisan obligations to the American people to close ranks with the President.

In the article entitled "United States Wars Come When Congress Hesitates," written by David Lawrence and published in the Washington Evening Star of January 16, 1957, Mr. Lawrence asks:

Will history repeat itself? Will Congress hesitate to give the President of the United States power to act in a possible emergency? And will there be another world war due to an enemy's miscalculation of the intent of a vacillating America?

There is a strange parallel with what happened just before World War I, World War II, and the Korean war.

On March 4, 1917, the Congress adjourned and a resolution of authority requested by President Wilson to arm American merchant ships failed of passage because of a notorious filibuster.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the article by David Lawrence to which I have referred printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES WARS COME WHEN CONGRESS HESITATES—DANGER NOT IN GRANTING PRESIDENTIAL POWERS, BUT MISCALCULATIONS ABROAD

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON.—Will history repeat itself? Will Congress hesitate to give the President of the United States power to act in a possible emergency?

And will there be another world war due to an enemy's miscalculation of the intent of a vacillating America?

There is a strange parallel with what happened just before World War I, World War II, and the Korean war.

On March 4, 1917, the Congress adjourned and the resolution of authority requested by President Wilson to arm American merchant ships failed of passage because of a notorious filibuster.

Just 29 days later the President was asking for and Congress was passing a resolution to ratify a state of war which had begun when the Imperial German Government sank American ships without warning. The Berlin government had calculated that America would not intervene.

On May 27, 1941, President Franklin D. Roosevelt declared an unlimited national emergency and on August 12, 1941, the request of the President to extend the term of service under the Selective Service Act was granted by a margin of only one vote in the

House. Less than 4 months later the President was asking for, and Congress was voting, a declaration of a state of war with Germany and Japan.

In January 1950, Secretary of State Acheson announced that America's defense perimeter did not include Korea but that this would be left to the U. N. to protect. Six months later, the United States Army, Navy, and Air Force were engaging in a war inside Korea to repel aggression.

The language used by President Wilson in asking for authority to place the Armed Forces of the United States aboard its merchant ships in 1917 was almost identical with that of President Eisenhower in his message of January 5. Mr. Wilson said:

"No doubt I already possess that authority without special warrant of law, by the plain implication of my constitutional duties and powers; but I prefer, in the present circumstances, not to act upon general implication. I wish to feel that the authority and the power of the Congress are behind me in whatever it may become necessary for me to do."

What happened? A filibuster led by liberal Republicans, notably the late Senator George Norris, of Nebraska, resulted in the failure of the Senate to get a chance to vote. When Congress adjourned on March 4, Mr. Wilson issued a statement to the country:

"Although, as a matter of fact, the Nation and the representatives of the Nation stand back of the Executive with unprecedented unanimity and spirit, the impression made abroad will, of course, be that it is not so and that other governments may act as they please without fear that this Government can do anything at . . ."

"A little group of willful men, representing no opinion but their own, have rendered the great Government of the United States helpless and contemptible."

The importance of this bit of history is that American misfortune has followed every conspicuous exhibition of weakness in Congress.

To his credit, former President Truman has come out flatly in favor of granting the power that President Eisenhower has asked. But will the other Democrats follow him, or will they whittle down the pending resolution and give the impression that the President of the United States does not have the wholehearted support of the Congress?

In July 1939, the late Senator William Borah, liberal Republican, was telling the Senate there wasn't a chance of a world war and he opposed giving the President discretionary powers on an embargo of arms. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee refused to act. About a month later World War II broke out.

Will history repeat itself now? The testimony being recorded this week in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and Armed Services Committee has a familiar sound.

#### AMENDMENT OF McCARRAN-WALTER IMMIGRATION ACT

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, in connection with the introduction today by the senior Senator from New York [Mr. Ives] and a group of my colleagues, whom I have joined, of a bill to amend substantially the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act, it is to be noted that this bill does not deal specially with refugees and escapees. It is essential to the modernization of our country's immigration policy and to meet the urgent demands of our foreign policy that appropriate legislation be enacted for refugees and escapees. This should be in addition to the measure submitted today. It is expected that shortly the President will make recommendations to the Congress

and they will deserve consideration on the highest priority.

The senior Senator from New York and I also expect soon to offer proposed legislation on this subject.

We must now recognize that our immigration policy with respect to refugees and escapees rank as high-level foreign policy. The flight from Hungary of thousands of refugees and its meaning already proves that. One of our most potent weapons in the fight against communism is the establishment of an attractive alternative to those living under communism, offering those seeking escape from behind the Iron Curtain the prospect of resettlement. Indeed, we should adopt a policy that will attract to the free world as many as possible who are gifted and effective, who can make a major contribution to our society, and deprive the Communists of this benefit.

A bill to provide suitably for refugees and escapees needs to recognize also that the problem is recurrent—we have already had two previous Refugee Relief Acts—that it erupts out of major foreign policy issues, and that we have a considerable amount of unfinished business on hand right now. Under the 1953 Refugee Relief Act, which expired December 31 last, approximately 19,000 fewer visas were used than were available. In this connection, I am proud to say that the State of New York has absorbed about one-third of the refugees who have recently come from abroad. Yet many of the main categories of prospective immigrants for whom the act was intended were oversubscribed with over 24,000 more Italians wanting to come here than the law provided for, 11,000 Greeks, and 16,000 from Far Eastern countries. Also, there has been separation of families, some of whose members came in under the Refugee Relief Act, which needs to be corrected. In addition, it is essential to regularize the admission of about 15,000 Hungarian refugees who have been allowed to enter the United States on a parole status.

New problems are coming up, like those with respect to persons of Jewish faith expelled from Egypt, the Palestine-Arab refugees; and there may be yet other eruptions from behind the Iron Curtain creating new waves of refugees. With the necessary provisions for internal security and for our capability to provide housing and jobs, the President needs to be given authority over a period of years to admit refugees and escapees in our own national interest.

#### TAX RELIEF FOR SMALL CORPORATIONS

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, on Monday, January 7, I introduced S. 352, a bill designed to bring much-needed tax relief to small corporations. I have since been joined by six distinguished colleagues in the sponsorship of this vital piece of proposed legislation. My cosponsors are Mr. HILL, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. MORSE, and Mr. NEUBERGER. I am delighted to receive the active support of these distin-

guished Senators at the outset of the 85th Congress, and I trust that when I have completed my detailed analysis of S. 352, the great majority of this body will see fit to lend it their active support so that the bill may be enacted into law at the earliest possible date.

The purpose of S. 352 is simple. It is to bring substantial tax relief to the smallest corporations of this country. The bill accomplishes this purpose by substituting a graduated tax for the present normal and surtax on corporate income. The present law exacts a tax of 30 percent on all taxable corporate income up to \$25,000 and a tax of 52 percent on all income over that amount.

S. 352 would substitute the following rates:

| If the taxable income is:             | The tax is:  |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| Not over \$5,000-----                 | 5 percent of the taxable income.                       |
| Over \$5,000 but not over \$10,000.   | \$250 plus 10 percent of the excess over \$5,000.      |
| Over \$10,000 but not over \$15,000.  | \$750 plus 15 percent of the excess over \$10,000.     |
| Over \$15,000 but not over \$20,000.  | \$1,500 plus 25 percent of the excess over \$15,000.   |
| Over \$20,000 but not over \$25,000.  | \$2,750 plus 35 percent of the excess over \$20,000.   |
| Over \$25,000 but not over \$100,000. | \$4,500 plus 45 percent of the excess over \$25,000.   |
| Over \$100,000-----                   | \$38,250 plus 55 percent of the excess over \$100,000. |

The schedule of rates contained in S. 352 accomplishes two very important purposes: It brings the maximum relief to those who need it most, the smallest corporations, and it causes no loss in Federal revenues. In fact, I am informed by the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation that S. 352 would bring about an increase in revenues in the neighborhood of \$90 million a year if corporate income continues at its mid-1956 pace. While this revenue gain is significant, I am further informed that it would not be possible to lower any of the rates in S. 352 without causing revenue loss.

I do not intend to lose sight of the revenue gain embodied in S. 352, however. That gain could well be used to offset slight revenue losses implicit in other important small business tax-relief measures which I have introduced and which I shall discuss in detail in the near future.

I have said that S. 352 would bring the maximum relief to the smallest corporations. It would mean a tax saving in excess of 83 percent for all corporations earning up to \$5,000 a year. According to statistics compiled by the Treasury Department on corporate income for 1952—the latest year for which complete statistics on corporate income are available—corporations earning less than \$5,000 constituted nearly 47 percent of all corporations with net income.

S. 352 would bring a tax saving to all corporations earning up to \$375,000 a year. Again citing the Treasury statistics, such corporations constituted nearly 98 percent of all corporations reporting



net income in 1952. In other words, only about 2 percent of all corporations would pay increased taxes, and then in only relatively minor amounts.

For the benefit of my colleagues in their study of this measure, I request that there be printed in the *RECORD* at this point two tables, the first setting forth a

comparison of S. 352 and the present law on corporate income tax, and the second setting forth some detailed statistics on the structure of our corporate economy as of 1952.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the *RECORD*, as follows:

TABLE 1.—Comparison of present and proposed corporate income tax laws

| Income subject to tax | Effective rate (percent) |              | Present tax liability | Proposed tax liability | Change   |         |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|--------------|-----------------------|------------------------|----------|---------|
|                       | Present law              | Proposed law |                       |                        | Amount   | Percent |
| \$5,000.....          | 30.0                     | 5.0          | \$1,500               | \$250                  | -\$1,250 | -83.3   |
| \$10,000.....         | 30.0                     | 7.5          | 3,000                 | 750                    | -2,250   | -75     |
| \$15,000.....         | 30.0                     | 10.0         | 4,500                 | 1,500                  | -3,000   | -66.6   |
| \$20,000.....         | 30.0                     | 13.75        | 6,000                 | 2,750                  | -3,250   | -54.2   |
| \$25,000.....         | 30.0                     | 18.0         | 7,500                 | 4,500                  | -3,000   | -40     |
| \$50,000.....         | 41.0                     | 31.5         | 20,500                | 15,750                 | -4,750   | -23.2   |
| \$100,000.....        | 46.5                     | 38.25        | 46,500                | 38,250                 | -8,250   | -17.7   |
| \$250,000.....        | 49.8                     | 47.7         | 124,500               | 120,750                | -3,750   | -3.01   |
| \$375,000.....        | 50.53                    | 50.53        | 189,500               | 189,500                | None     | None    |
| \$500,000.....        | 50.9                     | 51.65        | 254,500               | 258,250                | +3,750   | +1.22   |
| \$1,000,000.....      | 51.4                     | 53.33        | 514,500               | 533,250                | +18,750  | +3.6    |
| \$5,000,000.....      | 51.9                     | 54.68        | 2,594,500             | 2,733,250              | +138,750 | +5.3    |
| \$10,000,000.....     | 51.95                    | 54.83        | 5,194,500             | 5,483,250              | +288,750 | +5.6    |

TABLE 2.—Corporation income tax returns for 1952, returns with net income

| Net income classes                  | Number of returns | Percent of total | Net income (thousands) | Percent of total | Income tax (thousands) |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------|------------------|------------------------|------------------|------------------------|
| Under \$5,000.....                  | 207,201           | 46.8             | \$340,250              | 0.8              | \$85,457               |
| \$5,000 under \$10,000.....         | 61,780            | 14.0             | 447,571                | 1.1              | 119,909                |
| \$10,000 under \$15,000.....        | 37,136            | 8.4              | 458,022                | 1.1              | 126,748                |
| \$15,000 under \$20,000.....        | 27,752            | 6.3              | 483,872                | 1.2              | 137,321                |
| \$20,000 under \$25,000.....        | 26,357            | 6.0              | 594,566                | 1.5              | 171,104                |
| \$25,000 under \$50,000.....        | 33,470            | 7.5              | 1,162,855              | 2.9              | 388,666                |
| \$50,000 under \$100,000.....       | 20,623            | 4.7              | 1,443,968              | 3.6              | 582,342                |
| \$100,000 under \$250,000.....      | 15,064            | 3.4              | 2,335,476              | 5.8              | 1,043,674              |
| \$250,000 under \$500,000.....      | 5,968             | 1.3              | 2,080,026              | 5.1              | 961,861                |
| \$500,000 under \$1,000,000.....    | 3,243             | .7               | 2,260,864              | 5.6              | 1,052,863              |
| \$1,000,000 under \$5,000,000.....  | 3,020             | .7               | 6,351,075              | 15.7             | 2,933,348              |
| \$5,000,000 under \$10,000,000..... | 455               | .1               | 3,129,000              | 7.7              | 1,453,751              |
| \$10,000,000 or more.....           | 508               | .1               | 19,344,152             | 47.9             | 8,539,788              |
| Total.....                          | 442,577           | 100.0            | 40,431,697             | 100.0            | 17,596,832             |

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I shall not labor the question of the need for the enactment of S. 352. Small business has received wide attention during the past year. Everyone appears to be in agreement that small business must be given some form of tax relief quickly. The platforms of both major political parties made prominent mention of this need last summer. In October the President endorsed proposals of his Cabinet Committee on Small Business which would have brought tax relief to small business with accompanying revenue losses approaching \$740 million. We no longer hear mention of relief for small business of such magnitude, however, for reasons which are clear to all of us.

It is very significant, nevertheless, that in his budget message to the Congress last week, the President conceded that some loss of revenue might be tolerated in just one area of the economy, namely for tax relief for small business. Here are the President's words:

In the area of taxation, I am especially interested in the problems of small business. Last August the Cabinet Committee on Small Business made a series of carefully considered recommendations in this field. Some relief in the tax burden affecting small business, as recommended by that committee, which will give help with a minimum loss of revenue, should have early consideration by the Congress. Any changes involving substantial loss of revenue should be considered at a later time when a general tax reduction is possible.

Mr. President, I submit that S. 352 will accomplish the maximum benefit envisaged by the President, and by all those who take a sober interest in the welfare of small business, and it will accomplish this most worthy objective without any loss of revenue, in fact with a slight gain.

S. 352 could bring immediate and substantial relief to the overwhelming majority of corporations in business today. And by virtue of section 1361 of the 1954 Internal Revenue Code, which grants an election to partnerships and proprietorships to be taxed as corporations, it could benefit hundreds of thousands of unincorporated businesses as well.

The melancholy statistics on small business failures continue to paint an ever-darkening picture of the outlook for small business in today's economy. Figures published by Dun & Bradstreet show that thus far in 1957, business failures are running ahead of those in 1956 and 1955. The current average is about 240 a week as against 222 in 1956 and 199 in 1955. There is an undeniable trend toward concentration of productive wealth. The Treasury's own statistics confirm this. Preliminary data on corporate income for 1953 show that there were fewer corporations with net income in 1953 than there were in 1952, but that the combined income of corporations in business in 1953 was in excess of that for

the larger number of corporations reporting in 1952.

If small corporations are to stay in business, they must have money to plow back into the business and to meet competition. Earnings of the business are potentially the best source for such funds. But today's oppressive corporate income tax rates make it virtually impossible for a small corporation to retain any significant part of its earnings. And the smaller the corporation, the more burdensome the present tax structure becomes in a company's effort to survive or to expand. S. 352 would give the smallest corporations the wherewithal to survive and to expand and to become truly competitive with their larger competitors. It would enable them to retain significant amounts of the earnings of the business for purposes of improving their products, expanding their facilities, enlarging their markets, to the benefit of all the taxpayers, the consuming public.

It may be true that world conditions have prevented any tax relief for small business which would cause substantial loss of revenue. But that does not discharge us from the responsibility of finding some solution to the problems so clearly confronting small business today. We cannot stand idly by and allow the deterioration of the small business segment of our economy to continue. Small business is the very essence of democracy and the lifeblood of our national economy. S. 352, in my opinion, provides a solution that accomplishes objectives on which I believe all of us can unite—immediate and substantial relief for small business and at no cost to the national revenues.

As chairman of the Select Committee on Small Business, I offer S. 352 for the Senate's most serious consideration and urge its early passage.

#### VISIT TO THE SENATE BY STUDENTS OF FORTIER HIGH SCHOOL, NEW ORLEANS, LA.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, today we have as our guests in the gallery 56 students of Fortier High School, New Orleans, La., who have been visiting Washington to attend the inauguration and who have been studying the processes of the Federal Government.

As a graduate of Fortier High School, I wish to welcome these young men and women and to extend to them the greetings of the other Members of this body.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the *RECORD* the names of these young men and women, together with the names of their faculty escorts.

There being no objection, the names were ordered to be printed in the *RECORD*, as follows:

#### FORTIER TOUR, JANUARY 18-25, 1957

Linda Adoue, Eva Augustine, Bill Baldwin, Joan Barrett, Kenneth Beoubay, Eddie Berns, Jo Ann Blais, Carolyn Boelte, Evelyn Bordon, Forrestine Boyd, Noel Breaud, Mary Michael Brierre, Sue Cantrell, Charleen Cormier, Emile Dieth, Frank Dietz, Virginia Dimiceli, Brenda Duhe, Charles Elchinger, Judy Feehan, Barbara Fischer, Shirley Gerber, Lynnda Gerson, Frieda Green, Sybil

Heim, Eleanor Kayman, Martha Kees, Harwood Koppel, Susan Korn, Ann Lacroux, Ann Lampo, Rochelle Lassen, Linda Las-trapes, Hilberth Leibe, Lynne Lennox, Noel Many, Mary Frances Meyer, Mary Moore, Carolyn Moses, Bonnie Nelson, Sharon Offner, Patty O'Neill, Dorothy O'Reilly, Sandra Pastel, John Pecoul, Mike Porter, Charlotte Redding, Myra Regenbogen, Betty Schully, Sylvia Shannon, Carol Stein, Jeannette Toledano, Frieda Trestman, May Walker, Karen Westbrook, and Emma Young.

Faculty: Mrs. M. L. Renaud, Miss Dorothy Kelly, Miss Elizabeth Vial, and Miss Rose Capraro.

# **POLICIES PURSUED BY EISENHOWER ADMINISTRATION IN THE MIDDLE EAST**

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the proposed resolution to authorize the use of American forces in the Middle East and to provide for economic assistance in that area is of great importance to the Members of the Congress, as well as to all of our citizens.

I know that Senators, as well as others who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, desire to have as much background information as possible regarding the policies which have been pursued by the Eisenhower administration in the Middle East. I, therefore, ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a series of articles written by Mr. Chalmers M. Roberts and published by the Washington Post and Times Herald.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of January 6, 1957]

## **AMERICA AND THE MIDEAST—UNITED STATES POLICY SHIFT DATES FROM 1953** (First of a series)

(By Chalmers M. Roberts)

On the morning of May 12, 1953, newspaper readers around the world saw a picture of Egyptian Premier Mohammed Naguib holding a silver-plated pistol presented to him in Cairo the day before by Secretary of State John Foster Dulles. The inscription read "To Gen. Mohammed Naguib from his friend, Dwight D. Eisenhower."

The photograph was symbolic of two things:

1. The beginning of the 4-month-old Eisenhower administration's swing away from the pro-Israeli policies of the Truman administration to what Dulles called a more impartial and objective attitude on the Arab-Israeli dispute, then as now the key internal Middle East problem.

2. The pistol incident also was symbolic of what was to become a long series of increasing differences of opinion between the United States and its two chief allies, Britain and France, over the Middle East. For the incident kicked up an immediate storm in London, where Prime Minister Winston Churchill had just denounced Naguib as a dictator whom Britain was prepared to resist with arms if Egypt physically challenged her right to remain in the Suez Canal Zone.

The choice of a pistol for a gift to Naguib was suggested by Henry Byroade, a West Point graduate, then Assistant Secretary of State for the Middle East area, later Ambassador to Cairo and now envoy to the Union of South Africa. Ten months earlier, a group of young Egyptian army officers had forced the corrupt King Farouk to abdicate his throne. Led by Gamal Abdel Nasser, they had set up Naguib as their front man. Na-

guib was ousted by Nasser about a year and a half after the Dulles visit and ever since has been under house arrest.

Dulles, who had never before been in the Middle East, was on a swing through that area when he stopped in Cairo. In a radio-television report on his trip, Dulles advised Israel to cease to look upon itself \* \* \* as an alien in the Middle East; he noted that the Arabs fear lest the United States become the backer of expansionist Zionism, he pledged the Eisenhower administration to the 1950 Tripartite Declaration to guarantee the Arab-Israeli armistice lines, adding that "we cannot afford to be distrusted by millions (of Arabs) who could be sturdy friends of freedom."

That September, Dulles suspended economic aid to Israel for 5 weeks because Israel had refused to stop work on a Jordan River water diversion project as ordered by the United Nations. The next April, Byroade publicly told Israel to drop the attitude of the conqueror and he advised the Arabs to accept Israel as an accomplished fact.

Along with this policy of impartiality between the Arabs and the Jews, Dulles pushed three other main lines of action—a British-Egyptian settlement of the Suez Canal zone dispute, the development of the northern tier defense concept against the Soviet Union and the Jordan River valley plan for economic development.

At the close of World War II, the British and French had pulled out of many Middle East lands which they had held since the breakup of the Ottoman Empire after the First World War. By August 1954, Britain agreed to end her 70-year occupation of all or part of Egypt by coming to terms with Egypt on evacuation of the Suez Canal Zone. Dulles called that pact a new and more permanent basis for tranquility and security of the area.

The State Department said the then American Ambassador in Cairo, Jefferson Caffery, played an important role in the Suez zone agreement—that is, he pressured both Britain and Egypt to settle their differences. American and British officials say that both their Governments at the time felt that once the canal zone issue was settled, the war would be opened to settlement of other disputes such as the future of the Suez Canal (the concession then had 13 years to run) and the Egyptian-Israeli issue, including the Egyptian blockade of the Suez Canal against Israeli shipping. Israel pressed in vain for inclusion of the lifting of that ban as part of the Anglo-Egyptian Pact.

The truth is, American and British diplomats now agree, that both were counting on the goodwill of Nasser. Both were content when Egypt agreed to restate at the time the 1888 Constantinople Convention principle of free navigation through the canal. Nasser agreed to that statement only after Britain agreed to recognize Egyptian sovereignty by declaring that the canal was an integral part of Egypt.

In retrospect, many have said that the reluctant withdrawal of some 83,000 British troops created a power vacuum. As the London Daily Telegraph put it last November: "We beg Americans to recall that it was their Government which put the heaviest pressure upon us to evacuate the canal (zone)—a step which is at the root of all our troubles."

The facts, however, were that the British Government, like the American, was counting on Nasser now to turn his attention to solving internal Egyptian problems. Dulles declared he was certain the settlement would establish the foundation for even closer collaboration in working out Middle East problems.

The American pressure on Britain was, without doubt, founded on the thesis that British colonialism must give way here as elsewhere in the Middle East. Dulles, in

fact, in 1954 ordered a study of how America should deal with this colonialism issue and at one point of frustration with the British and French he was even tempted to cut the United States loose from its allies. But he decided against such a move on the grounds that it would have a catastrophic effect on such Allied ventures as the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Instead, Dulles and the President developed the idea that the United States role should be that of a mediator in colonialism issues in order to cushion the inevitable changes.

Subsequently there was a long series of disagreements with London over British colonialism in the area: in Jordan and Saudi Arabia over the Burami Oasis dispute; in Iraq, as well as in Egypt and elsewhere. Dulles likewise displeased the French by the American refusal to stand with Paris at the U. N. in the disputes over north Africa.

At the same time, Dulles' efforts, which as he saw them, were to create a balanced policy between Israel and her hostile neighbors, convinced Israel that the Eisenhower administration was becoming more and more pro-Arab; yet they failed to win Arab friendship because the administration was not publicly anti-Israel nor anti-British and anti-French.

Another Dulles line of action, the northern tier concept, was part of what his critics have called his pactomania; that is, his efforts to surround the Sino-Soviet heartland with a series of military arrangements designed to deter Russian or Chinese Communist aggression.

From his 1953 Middle East trip, Dulles developed the idea of a military alliance among the Middle East's northern tier of states; that is, those states touching or almost touching the Soviet Union—Turkey, Iran, Pakistan, and Afghanistan. This, Dulles, said in late 1953, would bring the free world's defense line right up on the Soviet border.

Out of this idea came the American arms agreement with Pakistan in December 1953, which so aroused the Indians, and the Turkish-Iraqi Pact which split the Arab world but which evolved, by the spring of 1955, into the Baghdad Pact when Britain joined up. Afghanistan has, however, remained outside the pact.

Dulles feels that his "northern tier" idea was perverted by the British when they persuaded Iraq, an Arab state, to join. One reason the British did so was to undercut the nationalist pressures in Iraq against British bases there. This was accomplished by hauling down the Union Jack and turning the airfields, still used by the Royal Air Force, into Baghdad Pact bases.

Egyptian reaction to the "northern tier" was loud and negative. The Russians called the Baghdad Pact "a stab in the back" of all Arab nations. India's Jawaharlal Nehru repeatedly condemned the pact. The United States refused to join Dulles' own creation despite many pleas from its members to do so.

Now, in a sense, the administration is proposing that the United States take on the responsibility of a pact member without joining that organization. America, of course, is giving arms to the pact's member nations along with economic help.

The Eisenhower administration's economic policy in the Middle East centered on the Jordan River Valley plan. This scheme for cooperative economic development, through American aid, of Israel and three Arab neighbors, Syria, Jordan, and Lebanon, had won technical approval of all four nations by late 1955. But it has never won the necessary political approval.

As American policy developed in the Middle East in the years 1953-56, the divergent British and American ways of looking at that area became more and more apparent. To the United States, the key problem was to keep the Russians out. To the British, the



key problem was to shore up their own crumbling position in the area in order to maintain the vital flow of oil to Britain and Western Europe.

From these divergent viewpoints sprang the often-heard Anglo-French complaint that the United States did not understand the vital necessity of that oil. This, however, does not stand up as a fair criticism of Dulles. His argument was that the oil could not be preserved nor could its continued delivery via the Suez Canal be guaranteed unless British colonial policies were gradually modified or liquidated in the face of Arab nationalism fanned by the Soviet Union. Dulles also knew well that some 60 percent of the whole Middle East oil investment is American.

This Dulles policy of attempting to keep Arab nationalism within bounds by concessions to the Arabs—concessions of necessity chiefly by the British and French—not only strained the Atlantic Alliance but it made Israel feel increasingly deserted by the United States.

In February 1955 David Ben-Gurion came out of retirement to launch a more aggressive Israeli policy. Within a week, Israelis killed some 38 Arabs in a heavy raid on the Egyptians in the Gaza strip. Ben-Gurion argued that Israel must defend itself in what amounted to an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth policy of raids and counterraids. He felt the U. N. only talked, that the Arabs were being emboldened by the West, that the United States was adopting, as it was, a policy of no firm commitment to either Israel or her neighbors which meant only a dribble of arms and no real border guaranty to Israel.

The Israeli strike at Gaza turned out to be a historic affair for it set in motion a series of events leading to the Egyptian arms deal with the Russians. By chance, these events coincided with new Soviet tactics.

Looking back on the Eisenhower administration's policies, or lack of them, in the Middle East from Inauguration Day in 1953 until the summer of 1955, two points are worth noting. One, affirmatively, is that the administration struck a new posture of attempting to win Arab friendship, in part on the assumption that Nasser and his colleagues represented a hopeful force in Egypt which was likely, if properly aided, to concentrate on Egypt's internal problems more than on its external quarrel with Israel.

The other point, a negative one, is simply that the Middle East was neglected. In the years 1953-55 the fact was that the administration was preoccupied by a series of major foreign problems elsewhere: ending the Korean war in 1953, halting the Communist advance in Indochina in 1954, escaping from the Communist-Nationalist quarrel over Quemoy and Matsu in 1955, finding a substitute for the European Defense Community in 1954, reopening negotiations with Russia in 1954 and, finally, grappling with the changing tactics of the Soviet Union in 1955 which culminated in the Summit Conference at Geneva.

But the interrelated nature of foreign policy is demonstrated by the fact that those changing Soviet tactics in the spring of 1955 were to play a major role in the Middle East. The new Eisenhower administration Middle East move is, in large part, a response to those tactics and their results thus far.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of January 7, 1957]

AMERICA AND THE MIDEAST—ARAB UNREST DUE TO SOVIET'S POLICY  
(Second of a series)

(By Chalmers M. Roberts)

The Russian decision to move into the Middle East through diplomatic and economic support for the Arab nations and op-

position to Israel was made at an historic Soviet Presidium meeting in April 1955.

It is difficult to disagree with Allen Dulles, head of the Central Intelligence Agency, in his estimate that "it may not be too much of an over-simplification to say that the eruption of the Middle East into a complex, dangerous crisis stems" from that Soviet decision.

At the time the decision was unknown, of course, to the Western world, although as early as April 7, 1955, a New York Herald Tribune reporter wrote from Cairo that "there has been talk of armament purchases from Communist Czechoslovakia."

What was known was the ancient Russian desire for an outlet in the Middle East, a desire dating back to the czars and flatly stated by the Communists in a secret 1940 message from Foreign Minister V. M. Molotov to his Nazi allies of the moment in Berlin.

In this message, captured by the Allies and published in 1948, Molotov wrote: "The focal point of the aspirations of the Soviet Union is south of Batum and Baku in the general direction of the Persian Gulf."

But the first public evidence of the Presidium decisions in April 1955 came in matters related to Europe: The agreement to sign an Austrian treaty, the Khrushchev-Bulganin visit to Belgrade to make up with Marshal Tito, the first Soviet disarmament proposals taken seriously in the West and the maneuvers leading up to the Big Four meeting at the Summit that July.

#### NASSER GIVES OPENING

These events bedazzled the world; the Middle East was hardly in the news. But behind the scenes in Cairo, Egyptian President Gamal Abdel Nasser suddenly gave the Kremlin the opening it needed to expand into the Middle East. Nasser's prestige had been inflated by his presence at the April 1955 Afro-Asian Conference at Bandung—and his position at home had been imperiled by the aggressive policies of Israel's David Ben-Gurion.

As Nasser has repeatedly told it since, the Israeli attack on the Egyptians in the Gaza strip in February 1955, was "the turning point, the first time we felt the Israeli threat since our 1952 revolution." By April developments had reached the point the Russians were saying publicly that they would do everything to develop closer relations with Middle East nations "in the interest of peace."

Dulles has testified before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee that "I first heard" during June that Nasser "might be thinking of trying to get some arms from Czechoslovakia or from the Soviet Union." Dulles testified that "I did not, and to best of my knowledge, the President did not" raise the arms sale issue with the Russians at the Summit Conference in July.

Dulles' justification was that by July "our information was that the Egyptians had dropped the thought of getting arms from the Soviet bloc." Dulles also disclaims having received a report from Ambassador Henry Byroade in Cairo that on June 9 Nasser had told him he had approached the Soviet Ambassador to ask whether Russia would sell arms to Egypt. Other sources in the American Government, however, contend that there was firm information before the Summit Conference on a likely arms deal and that the issue was not raised with the Soviets as the result of an administration decision. The reasons remain obscure to this day.

#### PRESSURE ON NASSER

Nasser had first sought to buy arms from the United States, but obtained only what Dulles termed insignificant amounts. In July, after the Summit Conference and after his first approach to Russia, Nasser again asked for American arms. He and Dulles have publicly agreed that the chief reason

he did not get them was that American prices were too high.

Nasser was under pressure from his army officers to get arms and get them quickly because of the tougher Israeli policies of Ben-Gurion.

The July 26 Israeli election showed gains for the extremists who favored direct action against the Arabs. Nasser contended later that the results increased the threat to Egypt and spurred his search for arms. Five days earlier Dmitri Shepilov, then the editor of Pravda and now Soviet Foreign Minister, visited Cairo and apparently offered to open for Nasser the vast storehouse of Soviet arms, not for cash, but for bartered cotton with years to pay. At the moment, Shepilov's bosses, Bulganin and Khrushchev, were meeting in Geneva with President Eisenhower.

#### LATE UNITED STATES EFFORT

Just before the Soviet arms deal was announced, but with full knowledge that it was coming, Dulles in a speech said the United States would join in a guaranty of Arab-Israeli borders if the two sides could reach an agreement. And he also promised American help to settle the Arab refugee issue.

But it was too late. Nasser signed with Moscow and announced it to the world on September 27. At this point, however, the news, which already had partly leaked out, was almost lost in the wake of Mr. Eisenhower's heart attack of 6 days earlier.

From the arms deal—announced as being with Czechoslovakia, although Nasser later conceded it was with Russia—flowed a series of reactions and counterreactions. Chiefly, they came down to this:

Dulles dispatched Assistant Secretary of State George Allen to Cairo to see if the deal could be limited to a one-shot affair, but Allen's trip was widely interpreted as American panic and a sign of weakness.

#### MIXUP IN CAIRO

A curious aspect of the Allen visit to Cairo was the action of an American Central Intelligence Agency employee who, apparently hoping to soften the blow, tipped off Nasser that Allen was bringing him a protest note from Dulles. Nasser later revealed the incident in his speech nationalizing the Suez Canal Co., saying that he had threatened to throw Allen out of his office if he said "something unpleasant." The facts, as detailed in the Washington Post of September 24, 1956, were quite different, however. To the story then printed now can be added the fact that before calling on Nasser the CIA employee had informed the American Ambassador, Henry Byroade, of what he intended to do, although the State Department in Washington was not informed. Lack of time was the excuse. Byroade is said to have interposed no objection.

The President wrote Bulganin about the arms deal and received a reply that it was only a normal business transaction. Dulles and his British and French colleagues, who could get no satisfaction from Molotov at the Big Four Foreign Ministers conference that fall, soon found themselves besieged by the Israeli in quest of arms.

#### ARMS REQUEST FILED

Dulles held off, arguing that to give Israel arms now would start an arms race that could only end in disaster for Israel or even in a general war. Israel presented an arms shopping list which to this day remains in a Washington pigeonhole. As it turned out, it was the next spring, after Prime Minister Anthony Eden's visit to Washington, that Dulles passed the word to the Israelis to shop elsewhere, especially in France and Canada, with his quiet blessing.

The French, especially, were unhappy at being put in this position but eventually they did deliver jet aircraft to Israel. And as time went on the French, despairing of

American help in their fight with the Algerian rebels, moved closer to Israel, finally to the point of secretly sending many more planes and arms before the attack on Egypt last November.

#### TWOFOLD BRITISH REACTION

The British reaction to the Soviet arms deal was twofold: Joining the Baghdad Pact and attempting to pressure Jordan into the pact, plus some blunt speaking to Bulganin and Khrushchev during their London visit.

The first effort in December 1955, blew up in Britain's face and in the end led to a pro-Nasser regime in Jordan. Egypt countered also by creation of a joint Arab defense setup and by using Saudi Arabian funds (ironically received from American oil revenues) for subversion in Jordan, Syria, and elsewhere in the Arab world.

The Arab-Israeli dispute was at white heat when Eden came to Washington in early 1956. But little came of that visit beyond a new United Nations peace effort, the sending of Secretary General Dag Hammarskjöld to the area. His efforts resulted in a few weeks of calm.

#### DIFFERENCES GROW ACUTE

In early April, Anglo-American policy difference had grown acute. The British were saying flatly that they would go to war to protect their Persian Gulf oil sources though there was practically no mention of the Suez Canal, so soon to be the center of controversy.

Jordan's dismissal at this point of Glubb Pasha, the Englishman who long had commanded the Arab Legion, was a shock to London. Britain was angered too, when Dulles told a press conference that Nasser was "actuated primarily by a desire to maintain the genuine independence of the area—the same desire that I expressed."

The war talk led President Eisenhower to make a public statement that the United States would assist any Middle East victim of aggression under the 1950 Tripartite Declaration, a statement urged by Eden. Next day, April 10, 1956, Dulles met with congressional leaders to alert Congress to a possible request for authority to use American forces in the Middle East. But he said there would be no request "at this time."

At this point, unlike today, the issue was presented as what to do in case of an Arab-Israeli war rather than what to do about Soviet aggression in the Middle East.

#### RED PEACE STATEMENT

The Russians apparently were surprised at the success of their arms deal in making the Middle East pot boil. Fearing they had gone too far, the Russians, on April 17, 1956, came out for a settlement acceptable to both the Arabs and Israel.

The Soviet peace statement lowered the Middle East temperature. A week later when Bulganin and Khrushchev visited London, Eden told them Middle East oil was vital to Britain and the British would fight for it rather than be strangled by its loss. The Russians made quite a fuss over these sharp words and asked whether Eden was threatening the Soviet Union with war. To this Eden replied, No, just telling you the plain facts so there will be no possibility of miscalculation. Nothing further was said about the matter.

A report of this private conversation convinced Dulles that the Russians had been quite naive about the Middle East, possibly actually thinking they could sell arms without creating the risk of war. Dulles felt they had done a lot of blundering but now had wakened up to the fact they had lit a fuse and therefore were trying to stamp it out. The April 17 Soviet peace statement was repeated in the Anglo-Soviet communiqué at the end of the London visit.

The relative calm which descended in the Middle East thereafter, partly due to the Hammarskjöld mission, was not to last long,

however. It ended on July 26 when Nasser announced nationalization of the Suez Canal Co. following the American withdrawal of aid to help build the Aswan Dam.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of January 8, 1957]

#### AMERICA AND THE MIDEAST—ASWAN DAM DISPUTE LONG IN THE MAKING (Third of a series)

(By Chalmers M. Roberts)

One of the Anglo-American steps to counter the Soviet arms deal with Egypt was the offer of aid to help build the giant Aswan Dam on the Nile River. The story is illuminating.

The arms deal was announced on September 27, 1955. The next month, according to the London Observer, British Prime Minister Anthony Eden summoned an American Embassy official at 1 a. m. to tell him the United States must help finance the Aswan Dam or else Nasser would go over to the Russians.

Eden wanted a quick answer but Washington took 4 weeks to make up its mind. On December 17, it was announced that the United States would put up \$54.6 million and the British \$15.4 million to make possible a \$200-million loan by the World Bank.

The Aswan Dam, a massive project which would take at least 15 years to complete, was a dream of Egyptian President Gamal Abdel Nasser. He once said that the dam, "more magnificent and 17 times greater than the Pyramids, will provide a higher standard of living for all Egyptians." Its total cost was reckoned at \$1.3 billion with the foreign help vital to obtain machinery from abroad.

During the long Anglo-Egyptian negotiations over evacuation of the Suez Canal zone, the United States held back on any aid for the long-discussed project, using it as a lever on Egypt. But not until after the Russian-Egyptian arms deal and rumors of a Soviet offer to finance the dam did the Western Powers agree to help finance it. Yet to this day there is no firm evidence that Moscow ever intended to put up such a big chunk of money.

The American-aid offer was conditional and World Bank President Eugene Black visited Cairo in February 1956 to talk about the project with Nasser. Nasser did not know it but at the time Britain wanted the bank to go ahead without the conditions on which Black was insisting.

Nasser did agree to let the bank see Egypt's books to assure it that the economy was properly balanced—a step designed at least to provide leverage against any further arms deals with the Soviets. By July, just before the United States called off the aid offer and Nasser retaliated by nationalizing the Suez Canal Co., the Egyptian President had worked out a full agreement with the bank.

But meanwhile the British had soured on their own idea and sold Secretary of State John Foster Dulles on allowing the aid offer to lapse.

The British change of mind began with a Cairo incident on March 2. Foreign Secretary Selwyn Lloyd had just returned to the British Embassy after a pleasant dinner with Nasser when he was handed a telegram saying that Jordan had abruptly fired Lt. Gen. John Bagot Glubb, the famed Glubb Pasha who long had headed the Arab Legion. The British say that both they and the Americans soon determined that Nasser had been responsible for Glubb's ouster.

Nothing more was done at the moment about the dam because of a flareup on the Arab-Israeli frontiers.

In either April or May 1956, London asked Washington to agree to call off the dam-aid offer. Dulles by now had come to the conclusion that Nasser was blackmailing the West by his constant hints of taking up the rumored Soviet offer. Nothing was said

publicly, however, and in June Nasser told the visiting publisher of the Long Island Newsday that he had been waiting since February for a firm aid offer. He complained:

"The West had neglected us. Russia hasn't."

It may well be that Nasser's diplomatic recognition of Communist China on May 16 settled the dam issue for Washington.

At any rate, word that the United States intended to say "no" seems to have leaked back to Cairo. On July 17, the Egyptian Ambassador to the United States returned to Washington and announced that "we have decided" to accept the western aid offer.

The day before, however, it was revealed that the Senate Appropriations Committee, which had taken closed-door testimony from Dulles on the dam proposal, had ordered the administration not to proceed without prior committee approval. At the time there was some grumbling at the Capitol about helping to build a dam which could increase Egyptian cotton acreage in the face of a massive American cotton surplus.

Dulles promptly stated the administration would refuse to be bound by the Senate committee action, a reflection of the old fight against legislative attempts to invade executive areas of responsibility. But Dulles had told the committee in private, it turned out, that he did not see any likelihood of "an early utilization" of American funds for the dam.

Then on July 19 Dulles informed the Egyptian Ambassador and immediately thereafter publicly announced that it was "not feasible in present circumstances" to help finance the dam. The British Embassy had been trying the previous day to find out what Dulles would tell the Egyptian Ambassador but was informed it could not be told until the actual day of the announcement. London and the World Bank later also withdrew from the project.

In London, Eden heard of the Dulles statement on the news ticker. In Cairo, there was a hue and cry which centered on Dulles' statement that recent events had rendered uncertain Egypt's ability to carry her share of the financial burden.

On Tuesday, the 24th, Nasser in a bitter speech talked of the "shameful clamor raised in Washington and devoid of all principles of international usage" and of "lies, deceit, and delusion that the Egyptian economy is impotent and unstable." He went on:

"I look at them and tell them: 'Die in your rage. You shall not dominate or tyrannize us.'"

Nasser added that he would tell Egypt "on Thursday" how he had "acted so that all its projects—such as this project (the Aswan Dam)—may be projects of sovereignty, dignity, and not those of humiliation, slavery, domination, rule, and exploitation."

On Thursday, July 26, Nasser announced he had nationalized the old Universal Suez Canal Co.

In defending himself against charges that his abrupt "no" to Egypt had brought on the canal nationalization and the subsequent Middle East crisis, Dulles later said he was "quite confident it would have happened in any event" and that Nasser had said he had been planning for it "for over 2 years."

Yugoslavia's President Tito in part confirmed this view by revealing last November that Nasser had told him in January 1955, "that he would have to nationalize the Suez Canal one day because Egypt, as an independent country, could not tolerate foreigners exercising authority on her territory."

What manner of man is Nasser anyway? This question has been argued and debated in Washington, London, and Paris for years with evaluations of him rising and falling like a stock market chart. The State Department long was divided, with Henry Byroade,



then Ambassador in Cairo, bullish, and George Allen, then Assistant Secretary for the area, increasingly bearish. Dulles alternated in his opinion as did many of his subordinates.

Perhaps the best documentation of Nasser's regime was done by Edmond Taylor, long a foreign correspondent. In a series of articles written shortly after Nasser seized the canal, Taylor made these points among many:

Nasser wrote in his *Philosophy of the Revolution* that the Middle East is waiting for its hero. He foresaw a vast empire, from the Atlantic to the Persian Gulf. He pictured Egypt as the leader of the Moslem world and of Africa. Taylor noted Nasser had been "elected" President in a familiar totalitarian-type plebiscite by a 99.9-percent vote.

By ruthless sabotage in early 1955 Nasser killed off a promising Franco-Algerian effort to bring about a peaceful settlement in Algeria. He gave sanctuary to the chief enemy of Tunisian Premier Habib Bourguiba and "supplied him with arms and money to launch a fifth column against Bourguiba."

Nasser fired the only two resolutely anti-Communist members still left in his cabinet. He brought back from exile in Switzerland Maj. Khaled Mohieddin, known as the "Red major," and set him up as a newspaper publisher in Cairo. He hired a fairly notorious group of ex-Nazis including Gen. Otto Remer, the man who broke up the 1944 officers' revolt against Hitler; Willy Beisner, former Nazi police chief, and former Goebbels propagandist Johannes von Leers. He tossed out of Egypt a Canadian newsmen in search of von Leers' boss, reputedly an even bigger fish.

Nasser uses Radio Cairo to fan trouble all over the Middle East and Africa—anti-French incitements to North Africa, anti-Israel propaganda to the Arabs, a campaign to drive the British out of Aden, incitement to the Mau Mau terrorists in Kenya, separatist appeals to various areas of Ethiopia. (Broadcasts about America have reached the point of declaring, as did one on October 11, 1955, that United States democracy leaves the capitalist free to rule the country while the masses chase dollars and watch baseball. The U. S. S. R. is a true democracy with rulers taken from the people through the Communist Party.)

Taylor also reported that one of the men named by Nasser as a director of the new Egyptian Canal Authority was Dr. Mustapha el Hafnaoui. He had been an Egyptian government scholarship student in Paris in 1950 where for a year he used the old Canal Co.'s records to write a thesis advocating nationalization.

The extent to which Nasser had permitted Russian and Communist penetration into Egypt is difficult to determine. All sorts of Russians, by the hundreds, from military technicians to ballet dancers have turned up. Clarie Sterling, in the *Reporter* magazine, has written that the Egyptian Industrial Bank's director is the man who made the Arabic translation of Marx's *Das Kapital*. She wrote last month that communism is more than merely acceptable in Egypt today; it is fashionable.

The extent of Soviet arms poured into Egypt also is difficult to determine. Britain, France and Israel all have declared, after their attack on Egypt, that the Communist supplies were far greater than anyone had suspected, including a million unexplained blankets found cached in the Sinai Desert. American officials have tended to look with a jaundiced eye, however, on these claims, particularly since the Israeli have declined to this day to show the arms to Americans. United States officials do not deny, of course, that Egypt received what, for it, was a massive amount of aircraft and ground weapons.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of January 9, 1957]

#### AMERICA AND THE MIDEAST—THREE PHASES NOTED IN SUEZ CRISIS

(Fourth of a series)

(By Chalmers M. Roberts)

When Britain and France heard that Egyptian President Gamal Abdel Nasser had nationalized the old Suez Canal Co., their first reaction was to strike him with military force.

To Britain, Nasser's action was insufferable for it threatened Britain's vital oil supplies in the Middle East. To France, it was additionally insufferable because of Nasser's aid to the Algerian rebels. Both governments were determined to bring Nasser down.

When one looks back to that July day last summer, it now becomes clear that the subsequent Suez crisis fell into three phases.

The first was the immediate reaction, then a quick realization that Anglo-French forces were woefully unprepared to attack Egypt and seize the canal. Secretary of State John Foster Dulles, however, was convinced that he prevented military action by flying to London to organize the first Suez Conference.

The second phase grew out of the failure of the Menzies mission to persuade Cairo to accept the 18-nation London plan for international control of the canal. Britain and France once again prepared to fight. Once again, Dulles felt he prevented war by dreaming up the ill-fated Suez Canal Users Association as a delaying tactic. This time he probably was correct.

The third phase grew out of Anglo-French bitterness at Dulles and President Eisenhower, in part over the canal users plan, in part because of a growing feeling that the United States did not understand the problem of the British and French and was letting them down. This phase brought a determination to move on their own, without telling Washington. It ended with the attack on Egypt immediately following the Israeli drive across the Sinai Desert, and with American charges of collusion by the three nations.

#### MUTUAL RECRIMINATION

The whole period was characterized by a growing rift in the Atlantic Alliance, ending in mutual recrimination as the United States voted with the Soviet Union at the United Nations to order a cease-fire and then for an Anglo-French withdrawal forthwith. It was complicated by a Soviet threat of force against Britain and France—the Russians mentioned rockets—unless there was a cease-fire and a second threat, to send "volunteers" to Egypt unless the British and French withdrew.

When Nasser seized the canal on July 26, 1956, British Prime Minister Anthony Eden at once cabled President Eisenhower that the Allies must stand firm against Nasser over the canal, that they must not let him "get away with it," that the issue was vital both to Britain's position and prestige in the Middle East and to America's position there as well. Eden asked the President to send over a representative (Dulles then was in South America) to meet with him and French Foreign Minister Christian Pineau.

Eden was shocked when Deputy Undersecretary of State Robert Murphy arrived in London with instructions only to listen. By the morning of July 31, Dulles, now back in Washington, was convinced the British and French were planning to attack and so he flew to London. It now appears they very likely would have done so except that they found they were not capable of effective action. No decision to attack was taken.

The Menzies mission, headed by the Australian Prime Minister, was in Cairo from September 2 to 9. On the 5th President Eisenhower reiterated to a press conference that "the United States is committed to a

peaceful solution of this problem," a remark about which Menzies later personally complained to the President as having undercut his efforts by removing the threat of force. On the 6th it was reported to Eden that the conference with Nasser would fail.

#### EDEN'S CABLE TO IKE

That day Eden sent a cable to President Eisenhower, as Marquis Childs has revealed in the *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*, stating that the peril to the West's position had become so great that the choice was between using force or "sitting by and waiting to perish." To this urgent message, Childs reported from London, the President replied, as the British saw it, with something like surprise and pique, asking in effect why Britain was getting so excited.

That is the British version. The American version, as told by Dulles to Bob Considine of International News Service last October, was that the Eisenhower reply warned Eden that any immediate resort to force would be "unproductive."

According to this version, Dulles gave the note to the British Ambassador, Sir Roger Makis, at 10 p. m. on September 8, after having gone over it at the White House with the President. The two men also talked over the Suez Canal Users Association plan. Considine quoted Dulles as having said: "It has devolved upon me to find an alternative that won't precipitate war or give Nasser a complete victory. I've been conjuring ways and means \* \* \*."

The means chosen was the Canal Users plan and Makis was told about it when he was given the President's reply to Eden. But Dulles would not give him the text until the next day.

Eden announced the plan in the House of Commons on September 12 and it soon leaked out that it had been Dulles' idea. But Dulles a day later publicly undercut the tough nature of the proposal to virtually take over administration of the canal by saying that no American ship would "shoot its way through" Suez.

#### IDEA OF TRAFFIC DIVERSION

Eden's concentration was on using the new association to force a showdown with Nasser. Dulles, however, was rather to give Nasser another chance to compromise and, if he refused, to turn the canal into a "dry ditch" by diverting traffic around the Cape of Good Hope. Dulles had agreed to all the details Eden announced but their differing approaches, plus the unwillingness of the British, Scandinavians, Italians, and other Allies to use the costly Cape route, led to recriminations. The United States talked about but never actually offered to pay that extra cost.

Britain and France felt that Dulles had cut the heart out of his own plan. Dulles had won time and prevented war by his maneuver, and that had been his policy. But he did so at the cost of distrust and ill-will—and an Anglo-French determination not to let the United States stay their hand again.

The Anglo-French frustration over the Canal Users Association debacle, plus the pressure from the Labor Party opposition in Britain led the two governments on September 26 to ask for a United Nations Security Council meetings on the canal issue.

Dulles tried to talk them out of this move on the grounds they had no case before the U. N. as yet, at least until the Canal Users Association was in action and had tried to put a ship through the canal with its own pilots. That idea never came off, however.

At the U. N. the British and French found themselves enmeshed in the fiasco of words. Secretary General Dag Hammarskjöld maneuvered the British, French, and Egyptian Foreign Ministers into a series of secret talks, out of which came six general principles endorsed by the Security Council,

principles in part the work of Dulles. During the secret talks, British Foreign Secretary Selwyn Lloyd offered to back down from the demand for international control to one of international supervision. Egypt would accept only international cooperation, though some progress was made on the issue of automatic sanctions in case either side refused to abide by arbitration of a future dispute over the canal.

#### DETAILS KEPT SECRET

Most of the details of the negotiation were kept secret until after the shooting started. But the progress was enough to make Dulles think the negotiations could continue later. Lloyd and Pineau, however, were embittered at Dulles over the canal users plan, Lloyd especially after a long postmidnight private talk with the Secretary.

The Russians, who had been making as much trouble as possible for the Western powers and encouraging the Egyptians not to compromise, vetoed presumably at Egyptian request, the attachment of the 18-nation London conference plan of August as the means of carrying out the six principles.

Lloyd and Pineau flew back to their capitals to report in person their discouragement over the United States and the United Nations. The last chance for a peaceful settlement, it is now clear, had gone by as far as the British and French Governments were concerned.

On October 12, the day of the U. N. agreement on six principles to settle the canal dispute, President Eisenhower declared during an election campaign radio-television appearance that the news from the U. N. was most gratifying and that it looked as though a very great crisis was "behind us."

The next day, Eden declared in a speech that the use of force could not be excluded in the settlement of the canal dispute. Four days later he, Lloyd, Mollet, and Pineau were meeting in Paris in what now seems to have been the conference at which they decided to go to war.

#### MOLLET EXPLAINS

Mollet explained, after the attack on Egypt, that the reason the British and French did not tell the United States what they were planning was that "we were afraid that if we had let you know, you would have prevented us doing it, and (to) that we would not agree, you see."

How could the Anglo-American alliance have reached such a point?

Eden became a man obsessed over the canal seizure. He saw in it the pattern of Munich and the Western surrenders to Hitler. In September, Eden repeated to the House of Commons what he had said when he parted with the Chamberlain government in 1938 "because I think it still applies." What he had said was that "I do not believe that we can make progress" by "appeasement."

On November 1, after the shooting started, Eden defended himself against "the personal accusation made yesterday that I myself was too much obsessed by the events of the 30's and was in consequence old fashioned." Eden went on: "However that may be, is there not one lesson of that period which cannot be ignored? It is that we best avoid great wars by taking even physical action to stop small ones."

Today, the latest reports from London have said, Eden still supremely believes what he did was right.

As to this side of the Atlantic, the President and Dulles at every turn tried to prevent Anglo-French action. They felt it would be disastrous for those nations and they feel events have proved them right.

#### AS DULLES SAW IT

From the day Nasser nationalized the canal Dulles felt that the British and French wanted less to settle the dispute than to destroy Nasser, and there is little reason to

doubt it. As Dulles saw it, the problem was one of prestige. Neither Britain, France, nor Egypt wanted anything the other side could claim as a victory. Dulles himself agreed in substance with the British and French that Nasser should not have a victory—but he opposed force to prevent him gaining one.

To Dulles, Suez was part of the American dilemma of being caught between colonialism, which he believes is inevitably passing, and the Atlantic Alliance. By a slip of the tongue at an October 3 press conference, Dulles linked the Suez issue with Anglo-French colonialism, a remark which made the British and French furious. And it added to the determination in London and Paris to go it alone.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of January 10, 1957]

AMERICA AND THE MIDEAST—BLOW AT CAIRO BELIEVED DECREED ON LAST OCTOBER 16

(Fifth of a series)

(By Chalmers M. Roberts)

On October 16, 1956, French Foreign Minister, Christian Pineau, told the French Assembly that American diplomacy is "difficult for us to follow" and that "one often has the impression that the United States does not understand, as we do, the obligations of the Atlantic Alliance."

Pineau went on to say that, "this evening we are to have a Franco-British meeting of major importance," adding later on that, "I may say we have some very considerable trumps up our sleeve."

That evening and into the morning of the next day, British Prime Minister Anthony Eden, his Foreign Secretary, Selwyn Lloyd; French Premier Guy Mollet, and Pineau met behind locked doors for 4 hours. The 4 men dismissed all their aides and interpreters, though Lloyd speaks no French and Pineau no English.

There is every reason today to believe that in that meeting the British and French Governments determined to go to war against Egypt in order to drive Nasser from power and force a favorable Suez Canal settlement.

Numerous efforts in the House of Commons to elicit from Eden details of that meeting have been fruitless. The most Eden would say was that "roughly from the beginning of August" Britain and France did have "military discussions of some kind" and that "there were a number of discussions on every kind of hypothetical attack in the Middle East." Eden would not answer Labor Party Leader Hugh Gaitskell's demand to know if it was on October 16 (or at a later meeting of the 4 leaders on the 23d) that, as Pineau told the French Assembly, Britain and France decided on the action they would take if Israel began a preventive war.

Eden's contention was that "there was no foreknowledge that Israel would attack Egypt," and, "there were no plans together (with France) to attack Egypt." Eden said the decision to send the ultimatum to Egypt was made 24 hours after the Israeli attack.

The United States Government is convinced these statements are untrue. And the now known circumstantial evidence, including some items which cannot be published overwhelmingly points to October 16 as the day the attack on Egypt was set in motion by Britain and France—and that France was the intermediary with Israel.

Here are some details, many gathered by a team of reporters for the London News Chronicle, others by the London Observer, the London Times, the Manchester Guardian, the Associated Press, and International News Service as well as this reporter.

Eden had barely left Paris on the 17th when Pineau called in the Israeli Ambassador. (An Israeli political leader, not a government member, had been in Paris in September and he is believed here to have been the first Franco-Israeli contact.)

Shortly after seeing Pineau, the Ambassador returned to Israel and Premier David Ben-Gurion thereupon told a party council that Israel would soon be able to rely on a "true ally," which was taken in Israel to be France.

On October 20, Anglo-French naval and air task force headquarters moved to Cyprus. On the 27th the overall Allied command headquarters moved to Cyprus. Troops, ships, and planes had, of course, been gathering in the Mediterranean since Egypt had nationalized the Suez Canal on July 26.

About mid-October France secretly began to reinforce Israel with planes, tanks, and guns. Neither Britain nor America were told of the figures. On the 26th a number of Israeli officers arrived in Paris. On October 29, the day Israel struck, at least two French jet fighter squadrons flew into Israel from Cyprus. The same day, reports of an impending Anglo-French invasion circulated in the lobbies of the French Parliament. Several French deputies phoned the reports to the American Embassy in Paris.

Parallel with these military moves—and every effort appears to have been made to keep them secret from the United States—were political activities which the Eisenhower administration is convinced were designed to mislead this country.

Immediately after the Anglo-French meeting in Paris on October 16 there began a blackout of communications between those two countries and the United States, a blackout which continued up to the time of the shooting. American officials in London and Paris found their counterparts evasive. (In fact, Alastair Buchan has written in the Reporter magazine that in this period "a curious atmosphere of furtiveness became apparent" in both London and Paris and "the usual flow of Cabinet minutes and top-secret memoranda among responsible officials dried up.")

About October 24, Secretary of State John Foster Dulles became alarmed at the strange silence. He had been hoping Britain and France would sit down with Egypt in Geneva on the 29th to renew the canal negotiations, although Lloyd on the 20th had publicly indicated that Britain would not agree. Dulles dispatched cables to his Ambassadors in Paris and London ordering them to try to find out what was going on.

The London Observer has printed the statement that on October 26 "American intelligence agencies detected a marked rise in the level of official cable and wireless traffic between Paris and Tel Aviv. It was on the basis of this information, rather than reports that Israel was continuing to mobilize . . . that President Eisenhower issued his warnings of October 27 and 28 to Mr. Ben-Gurion."

At any rate, Dulles' cables to the American envoys in London and Paris were fruitless; neither found out what was up. In London, not only did Ambassador Winthrop Aldrich learn nothing but in making his inquiries he was told by British Foreign Secretary Lloyd on October 28 that Lloyd was very hopeful of a peaceful canal settlement and that he planned to be back at the U. N. on November 12. This statement the United States considers to have been deliberately and totally misleading.

The first hard sign of military action was word of the Israeli mobilization which had begun on the 25th. News of it reached Washington October 26. (It also turned out that American military attachés in Israel had been shunned for some days by their usually cooperative British and French counterparts.)

The next day, President Eisenhower cabled Ben-Gurion warning him not to start a war. When no reply was received, a second message was sent on Sunday, October 28, and the world, whose attention then was riveted on Hungary, was given its first news of what



was afoot by a public statement from the President.

On Monday, the 29th, Israel struck into Egypt's Sinai Peninsula, the news reaching Eden late that evening. On the 30th Mollet and Pineau flew to London. Over a working lunch, the four leaders completed plans for the ultimatum to Egypt handed to the Egyptian Ambassador at 4:15 p. m.

The ultimatum, although also sent to Israel, actually applied only to Egypt. For it called on both belligerents to pull back 10 miles from the Suez Canal (that is, within Egyptian territory) and it demanded that Egypt also agree within 12 hours to permit Anglo-French forces to move temporarily into the towns of Port Said, Ismailia and Suez along the canal. The Anglo-French justification was that the ultimatum was designed "to separate the belligerents and guarantee freedom of transit through the canal." Dulles considered the ultimatum one of the most brutal ever delivered by any nation to another.

The American Ambassador in London had been told to be at the Foreign Office precisely at 4:45 p. m. But the British timing was slightly off for as he entered his car to go there an aide handed him a message that five minutes earlier Eden in Commons had announced the Anglo-French ultimatum.

The London News Chronicle reported that at the British Cabinet meeting that morning, before the arrival of Mollet and Pineau, Eden had argued that the allies could reckon on the hostile neutrality of the United States and that the United Nations would be powerless to intervene because of the veto in the Security Council.

Dulles, however, moved fast on hearing the news of the Israeli invasion. He called for an emergency Security Council meeting which began at 11 a. m., about the hour the ultimatum was being announced in London and Paris. At 1 p. m., the British and French Ministers in Washington (both Ambassadors were absent) met with Dulles and urged him to suspend further U. N. discussion until the next day. Dulles refused.

At 7:55 p. m. that night Britain and France vetoed the American resolution calling for a cease-fire and no help to either side by third parties. The Security Council continued to meet through the night, ending with a vote early Wednesday morning, the 31st, to refer the issue to the General Assembly under the "uniting for peace" procedure set up after the Korean war. Anglo-French efforts to prevent the referral were defeated. In all these votes the United States was allied with the Soviet Union.

By now the ultimatum had expired, Egypt having rejected it, and the Anglo-French air bombardment of Egyptian airfields was underway. Early Friday morning the Assembly voted, 62 to 2 (Britain and France) to discuss the issue. At 4:20 a. m. Saturday, November 2, the Assembly ordered a cease-fire by all four nations. The vote was 64 to 5 with 6 abstentions and 1 absentee. Standing with Britain and France were only Israel, Australia, and New Zealand. Canada and South Africa abstained; India and Pakistan voted yes. Thus the British Commonwealth was split. And once again the United States and the Soviet Union voted together.

The rest of the story is too well known to need detailing—the establishment of a United Nations emergency force and its development; the U. N. pressures for a cease-fire while at the same time struggling with the Soviet move to suppress the Hungarian rebellion; the vast chill which settled upon the relations between the United States and its two principal European allies, Britain and France; the violent internal argument which divided families and friends in Britain, and Eden's physical collapse which sent him to Jamaica for 3 weeks rest.

Britain and France agreed to the cease-fire on November 6 and it took place the next morning, Washington time. Anglo-French

troops completed their evacuation of Egypt on December 22, 48 days after the invasion and a month after the arrival of the first contingent of the U. N. force.

#### AMERICA AND THE MIDEAST—RUSSIAN ROCKET THREAT AFFECTED SUEZ CEASE-FIRE

(Last of a series)

(By Chalmers M. Roberts)

The Russians are known to have numbers of 700-mile-range rockets in place in East Germany, aimed at London and other British targets some 450 to 500 miles away. What part the Soviet threat to use them played in the Anglo-French cease-fire decision is one of the intriguing questions of the Middle East story.

That the rockets are in place, and are known to be in place by the British as well as the United States Government, are facts. It also is a fact that Soviet Premier Nikolai Bulganin late on November 5 sent a note to British Prime Minister Anthony Eden condemning the attack on Egypt which had begun 5 days earlier. In this message Bulganin said:

"In what position would Britain have found herself if she herself had been attacked by more powerful states possessing every kind of modern destructive weapon? And there are countries now which need not have sent a navy or air force to the coasts of Britain, but could have used other means, such as rocket technique.

Bulganin called on Britain to stop aggression. He noted that he had just sent a message to President Eisenhower proposing that Russia and America jointly use military forces to halt the war (a proposal the White House termed unthinkable and which the United Nations Security Council refused even to consider later the same day).

Bulganin concluded his message to Eden this way:

"We are fully determined to crush the aggressors and restore peace in the Middle East through the use of force. We hope at this critical moment you will display due prudence and draw the corresponding conclusions from this."

Eden was awakened in the early hours of November 6, presidential election day in America, to receive Bulganin's threat. About the same time French Premier Guy Mollet was receiving a similar, though less threateningly worded, Bulganin note. And by now Egypt and Israel had told the U. N. they would agree to a cease fire. But the Anglo-French force was still fighting its way along the Suez Canal, its objective as yet only partly seized.

Mr. Eisenhower phoned Eden in London and was told Britain and France had agreed to the cease fire to take effect at midnight. Reports from Paris indicate the French wanted to fight until the canal was all in hand, but gave in under British pressure.

At an election day White House meeting the President ordered a worldwide American military alert. The Chief of Naval Operations has revealed that two-thirds of the Navy was put to sea.

The British and French naturally have denied that the rocket threat played a part in their cease-fire decision. But American Ambassador to France Douglas Dillon commented in a December 10 radio interview that fear of Soviet action was the primary reason for the cease-fire. Later, Dillon put out a statement saying he had not meant to minimize the "moral pressure" of the U. N., but "only to indicate that a number of different elements may have influenced the British and French decision."

#### RUSSIA TAKES THE CREDIT

The Russians, in due course, took public credit for having brought about the cease-fire. And diplomatic reports from the Middle East indicate that much of the area believes

the Soviet rocket threat in fact did the trick.

In Washington at the time, American officials were divided. Some spent a jittery day after the Bulganin message to Eden; others considered it a Russian bluff, carefully timed for the moment when Moscow could be almost certain Britain and France were caving in under worldwide pressure to stop the war.

The question cannot be considered without reference to what else was then occurring. Two days before Bulganin sent the rocket threat, the Red army had launched its attack to crush the Hungarian rebellion and Premier Imre Nagy had appealed to the U. N. and the world for help. On the next day the U. N. voted condemnation of the Soviet armed intervention. And Moscow knew that the following day America was voting for a President.

#### THREAT OF INTERVENTION

The Russians, whatever their actual intentions, later added to their prestige in the Middle East by their threat to send "volunteers" to fight with Egypt unless Britain and France withdrew their forces. This threat, at the least, speeded the departure of the U. N. Emergency Force to Egypt.

The threat of Soviet intervention also appears to have played a part in Israeli Premier David Ben-Gurion's about-face decision to withdraw his forces from Egypt after having publicly declared he would not do so until real peace was achieved. Ben-Gurion reversed himself on November 8, after receiving a message the previous day from President Eisenhower which amounted to saying that if he refused and were attacked he would have to fight alone.

This story of Soviet threats and their effect constitutes a major part of the background which led the President and Secretary of State John Foster Dulles to the decision to ask Congress, for power to use American military forces in the Middle East.

#### SOVIET MOVES IN MIDEAST

The internal problems of the Middle East, as has been indicated in this series of articles, are old and complex. But beginning in the spring of 1955 the Soviet Union began to move into the area with diplomatic, economic and military support for Arab nations. Little more than a year later these Soviet moves had so heightened Middle East tensions that Egyptian President Gamal Abdel Nasser was emboldened to nationalize the Suez Canal Co.

From July 1956, when Nasser seized the canal, until war came at the end of October, Dulles fought a delaying action to prevent hostilities. He failed. During all those months the Soviet game was to make it ever more difficult for Nasser to compromise with Britain and France, if in fact he might have done so otherwise.

The events in Poland and Hungary in October and November, in the judgment of the President and Dulles, threw the Soviet Government off balance. And to Washington a Soviet Government off balance is a dangerous thing. It might, Washington felt, decide on a foreign adventure in the Middle East to take the spotlight off its satellite troubles. At the least it did harangue the world with words and threats, including the threats of rockets and volunteers, to divert attention from Hungary.

#### ADMINISTRATION COUNTERMOVES

The President told Congress in his Middle East speech of January 5 that because of Hungary "international communism needs and seeks a recognizable success," the Middle East is coveted by the Russians and that the Soviet rulers "do not scruple to use any means to gain their ends."

The Dulles deterrence thesis is that if the United States through the Congress and the President lets the Russians know it will fight if they attack the Middle East they will not

do so. This is, in essence, the theory he has applied in Western Europe and against the Red Chinese. Now it is being applied in the Middle East and Congress' assent in advance is being sought.

During the White House briefing of Congressional leaders on New Year's Day there was talk of what would happen if the Soviets did attack in the Middle East. According to one person present, the President somberly stated that, if they did attack, the United States would know where to hit Russia.

#### IKE'S VIEWS ON SUBVERSION

But what about indirect aggression, the subversion by communism of such lands as Syria and Jordan as well as Egypt?

The President's answer was that indirect aggression "rarely if ever succeeds where there is reasonable security against direct aggression." The answer, he said, was for the United States first to create that deterrence against overt Soviet attack, then to help local government create loyal security forces and to improve economic conditions so "as not to make communism seem an attractive alternative." These are the purposes behind the economic and military aid sections of the new Eisenhower program.

Whether such a program will work, assuming the Congress will vote it, is certainly open to question. The case of Syria is worth examining to see the nature of the problem.

Once part of the Ottoman Empire, Syria was a French mandate under the League of Nations in the years 1923-44. Arab nationalizing forced the French to get out as World War II was coming to an end and the mandate was split into two new nations, Syria and Lebanon. Syria is an Arab state of some 3.7 million persons, chiefly Moslems. It has reasonably good natural resources, though no oil. For years it was run by a group of leading conservative Arab families, some 20 to 40 using the army for control of the nation.

#### SYRIA MOVES TO LEFT

The rise of Gamal Abdel Nasser in Egypt and his arms deal with Russia, however, brought forward a group of younger officers who also began to play the Nasser game with Russia for arms and power. Chief of these is Lieut. Col. Abdel Hamid Serraj. Syria alone of the Arab States has a Communist deputy in its parliament, a man named Khalid Bakdash. Together with President Shukri Kuwaty they have pushed Syria closer and closer to the Soviet Union.

At the time of the Anglo-French attack on Egypt, the army (Serraj is head of its intelligence corps) took over effective control of the country. More recently the government arrested a number of leading Syrians, a former president, some members of parliament and former cabinet members, who represented the bulk of the conservative influence in the nation.

The charge against these men, some of whom have escaped the country, was conspiracy with Iraq. But the belief in Washington is that the move, in fact, was part of the Communist-inspired drive to destroy anyone who might stand up against the Soviet Union, whether or not Iraq had a finger in the pie.

On top of this, arms have been passed out by the Syrian army to large numbers of civilians, the estimates ranging from 15,000 to 60,000. This, in effect, is arming the mob, another Communist tactic. (In Egypt, Nasser also passed out arms at the time of the attack, but reports are they have since been taken up.)

#### RED GAME IN SYRIA

Thus the current reading of Syria is that it is ripe to become a Communist "people's democracy" at any time the Kremlin wants that. American officials tend to feel that Russia will prefer, however, to leave Syria

as it is; unstable, violently anti-Israel and generally anti-Western, in short impossible for the United States to deal with.

Syria today has far more Communist-supplied arms than a nation of its size needs. But it does not have enough arms or trained military men, despite some Soviet instructors, to serve as a major Russian base unless Moscow decides to move in directly. To do so, even by means of a base agreement, probably would hurt the Soviet cause elsewhere in the Middle East. Yet to let things ride as they are makes impossible any effective American dealings with Syria. And there can be no conclusive Arab-Israeli peace without peace with Syria.

Syria's game is to back Nasser's nationalism and anti-Westernism. Jordan, once a British mandate, is now under control of pro-Nasser leaders. Nasser himself came out of the Anglo-French-Israeli attack still an Arab hero, whatever the undercover grumbling of some of his rivals at home and abroad. And Anthony Eden, who was a sponsor of the attack, has paid with his political life.

As the Eisenhower administration is about to begin its second term, the Soviet Union is deeply involved in the Middle East. In the past 4 years the Middle East cauldron has simmered and boiled and then boiled over. Now it is back to a boil. To hold it there, then to reduce it to a simmer by eliminating the flame provided by Moscow so the area's internal problems can be solved, is the task for the second Eisenhower administration.

#### PROPOSED INVESTIGATION OF ALLEGED LABOR RACKETEERING AND CORRUPTION

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement setting forth my views on the proposed Senate investigation of alleged labor racketeering and corruption.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### STATEMENT BY SENATOR NEUBERGER

I intend to support a resolution calling for a Senate investigation of alleged labor racketeering and corruption, provided the constitutional rights of those involved will be fully protected.

I have always been opposed to racketeering and corruption in any segment of society. The vast majority of American trade unions are democratic in operation and have the worthy goal of improving the working conditions and living standards of their members. If any union officials violate these ideals, I see no valid objection to an investigation by an appropriate committee of the Senate, so long as the investigation is fairly conducted. The funds of dues-payers in unions should be safeguarded from looting and embezzlement.

It is in the best interest and welfare of the trade-union movement itself that any corrupt or dishonest influences be exposed and rooted out. A fair investigation will show, I am sure, that the overwhelming majority of American trade-union leaders are law abiding and respectable citizens.

Any investigation of labor racketeering might well be part of an extensive Senate study of organized crime, rackets and law enforcement in the United States. FBI statistics reveal that there was more major crime in our country during 1956 than at any time in history—a total of 2,534,000 separate acts. This was an increase of 12 percent over 1955. Law enforcement often is lax, inefficient, and even corrupt. We have relatively few adequately trained police de-

partments. Wholesale gambling and widespread use of liquor both contribute to this wave of major crimes. All are part of the loot to be gained from control of the underworld, and they cannot be separated from entrance of unscrupulous criminal elements into a few labor unions—to the detriment of the general public as well as the upright members of those unions.

#### THE FBI STORY—BOOK BY DON WHITEHEAD

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, several years ago on the floor of the Senate I protested a slanted and irrational account of the FBI contained in a book which in my opinion was a vicious, irresponsible attack designed to undermine public confidence in the FBI.

Today, I have a more pleasant report to make. I have recently concluded the reading of *The FBI Story*, by Don Whitehead. At last the record has been set straight.

In the foreword J. Edgar Hoover states:

No one person has built the FBI to the organization it is today. It was built by the loyal, sacrificial efforts of the thousands of men and women who have served in its ranks over the years. I tell my associates repeatedly that one man did not build the reputation of the FBI.

The subsequent pages indicate the truth of his assertion. We in America are inclined to take the FBI for granted. This book dramatically portrays the struggles which were necessary before the agency earned the public respect and confidence which it now possesses. The book is far from a dull, dry treatise. The reader will be intrigued by the dramatic facts now revealed concerning certain cases of national prominence.

There is one facet of the activities of the FBI, as discussed in this volume, to which I wish to direct specific attention. Being very much interested in South American affairs, it was of especial interest to me. I doubt that many persons are aware of the amazing exploits of agents of the FBI in the Western Hemisphere during World War II; the story of how Axis agents established a string of espionage bases from Mexico City southward to the Straits of Magellan has never previously been told. The book tells how the FBI organized the Special Intelligence Service, and thwarted the activities of the Nazis in South America.

Throughout the volume we learn of incident after incident which demonstrates the services of the FBI to the American people.

In the foreword by Director J. Edgar Hoover, there are several comments which are worthy of notice. I recommend one, in particular, to the attention of my colleagues. It is as follows:

The acts of the subversive, particularly the dyed-in-the-wool Communist, call for increased vigilance. The security of our country has suffered because too many of our people were hoodwinked by the propaganda which claimed that the Communist Party was a political party like the Democratic or Republican Party. Likewise, too many of our people have fallen for the line that spies, subversives, agents of foreign governments, and Communists who have been convicted and sent to prison are political prisoners.



Political prisoners do not exist in the United States. Those who are prisoners violated the laws of the United States, were indicted by Federal grand juries and convicted in Federal courts. I do not think they deserve the special treatment, with special rights and privileges, which is sought for them by their sympathizers.

I personally am pleased with the publication of this volume, and recommend it to all who desire to know about the outstanding job the FBI is performing in safeguarding our civil liberties and our national security.

#### THE DROUGHT SITUATION IN TEXAS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, it is in a spirit of deep seriousness that I report again to the Senate on the drought situation in my State of Texas.

During the last few days I have been in communication by telephone with men whose business it is to keep informed about conditions in Texas. Here are the reports they gave me:

From Amarillo, in the Texas Panhandle:

Right now I am looking out the window at a dust storm. There has been no rain here. A few sprinkles have been reported in the Fort Worth area, but the drought is still with us. The credit situation for farmers and cattlemen is growing steadily worse. Private lending institutions are having great difficulty in discounting their loans with the Federal Intermediate Credit Corporation because that institution is in turn having trouble selling its debentures. Against their will, lenders are having to foreclose in many cases.

From San Angelo, in west Texas:

No rain. The credit situation is unchanged, simply because the cattlemen have sold their cattle and are no longer borrowing. Landowners have some income from oil leases. The tenant farmers are in the worst condition because they do not have even this income. They have been able to survive only by getting jobs as oil field roughnecks.

From Johnson City, my home town, in the hill country of southwest Texas:

There has been no rain. Unless we have rain soon, and a great deal of it, no crops will be produced here this year. There is no deep ground moisture. The ground tanks for watering livestock have long since dried up. Farmers and stockmen with notes at the bank are increasing them when they can. The worst aspect of the situation is what is happening to the land. Even after we get lots of rain, the pasture land can't possibly recover for several years. Those who propose that we simply go out and plant grass after we get enough rain don't understand the situation. These pastures are going to have to be left to themselves for a sufficient time—3 or 4 years—if they are ever again to be the same as they used to be.

Mr. President, the statements I have quoted were not made by men who have a theoretical knowledge of the effects of the drought in Texas. These are men who know Texas and the land and people of Texas. They are men who feel a deep anguish as they see what is happening in the State they love.

Both immediate action and a long-range plan are vitally necessary to meet the problems posed by this disastrous

drought, which is now in its eighth year in many areas.

I know the Texas situation best, but let me emphasize that Texas is not the only State affected.

The Department of Agriculture reported last month that 2 million acres of land in a 15-State area have already been seriously damaged by winds incessantly blowing away all-important topsoil.

The Department reported further that if conditions remain unchanged in these 15 States during the winter and spring, farmers may lose another 29 million acres of topsoil.

It would be impossible to overstate the gravity of such a loss.

Mr. President, we must spend more money for emergency assistance to drought-stricken farmers and stockmen.

We must direct the Secretary of Agriculture to use authority he already has to bring what relief is possible to these people.

We must set up a deferred grazing program so that cattlemen can be adequately compensated for laying aside their pasture lands for several years after rain comes in order that the productivity of the land may be restored.

We must examine closely the credit policies that hamper the making of loans to victims of the drought.

There are hundreds of thousands of these victims. They have a right to look to the Congress for help. We would not be justified, in my earnest opinion, in refusing help.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. If I may, I should like to join the Senator from Texas in his remarks concerning the drought situation. Coming from the area of the country, as he does, which has been vitally affected by the drought, I am fully aware of the problems which arise by reason of the drought. As the Senator has suggested, it is not a problem that can be solved in a year or two.

Last year and the year before I introduced in this body certain bills designed to liberalize and simplify credit. I should like at this time to make the statement that again I shall introduce those bills for the purpose of simplifying and expanding farm credit as one of the things greatly needed in the drought area.

I thank the Senator for yielding to me, but I did want to join him in his remarks.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I deeply appreciate the statements of my distinguished friend from Colorado. All Members of the Senate have known of his deep interest in this subject, and of the contribution he has made in an attempt to render relief to the people, not only of his own State of Colorado, but of the entire drought-stricken area. I commend him for his interest and attention, and I express my deep appreciation to him for associating himself with my remarks.

Mr. President, I wish to make another brief statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUMPHREY in the chair). The Senator from Texas has the floor.

#### GAEL SULLIVAN

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, during the adjournment of Congress, our country lost a man who was one of the real political philosophers of our time. He was Gael Sullivan, who passed away at his New York home on October 27, 1956.

Gael Sullivan was my personal friend—and many Members of the Senate could properly claim they had the same privilege. He was a man whose vibrant personality touched many people, always to stimulate them into action.

He was uncompromising in his political beliefs, but he had the quality of human understanding which refused to be bound within narrow views. And he had unbounded enthusiasm for every project which he tackled.

Gael Sullivan was practically unknown when he was named executive director of the Democratic National Committee. His anonymity was due to the fact that he preferred work to publicity—and rarely took time even to have his picture taken.

His performance in the Nation's postal service was legendary, and he was the author of improvements which increased the efficiency of the agency many times. He believed that Government cannot be static in a dynamic world, and must constantly seek new and better methods of operation.

For the past 2 years, Gael Sullivan was the vice president of the Magna Theater Corp. in New York, but the greater part of his life was devoted to public service. In his passing, we have lost a loyal and devoted American, and he will be sorely missed.

I extend to his family my deepest sympathy.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I should like to be associated with the distinguished majority leader in paying tribute to the life and public service of Gael Sullivan. It was my pleasure to be associated with him, both while he was in the Post Office Department as Assistant Postmaster General and while he was deputy chairman of the Democratic National Committee, and in some of my own political endeavors.

Gael Sullivan was an able man. He had a high sense of public responsibility. He was a wonderful father to his splendid children, and he was a fine husband.

Gael Sullivan was the type of young man we can ill afford to lose. I certainly have lost a friend, and I join in paying tribute to him, and I express my sympathy to his wife and family.

#### ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO TUESDAY NEXT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that

when the Senate concludes its business today, it stand in adjournment until Tuesday next at noon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

#### LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR TUESDAY NEXT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to announce that it is planned to have printed today, and placed on the calendar, various resolutions which have been ordered reported by the Committee on Rules and Administration, so-called money resolutions, providing funds for various committees to conduct studies and investigations. Some of those resolutions are non-controversial. Some will require considerable time, I am sure, because several Senators have indicated to me that they desired to make a thorough study of the reasons justifying the resolutions.

It is the plan of the leadership to give the Senate an opportunity to proceed to the consideration of some of the resolutions on Tuesday. In view of the fact that they were ordered reported yesterday, we think that if they shall be printed and go on the calendar today, since the Senate will not be in session on Monday, we can take up at least the non-controversial resolutions on Tuesday.

I shall attempt to accommodate myself to the wishes of Senators in case they ask that the consideration of any of the resolutions be postponed for a reasonable length of time until Senators can study them; but I should like to have the RECORD show it is our plan to consider the resolutions on Tuesday.

We also have a bill—

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. If I may finish this statement, I shall yield to the Senator.

I should like to announce that there has been a bill favorably reported by the Committee on Banking and Currency, by the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], which increases the authorized lending limit of the Small Business Administration by some \$65 million. It is my understanding that the bill was reported unanimously, that it represents urgently needed legislation, and as soon as I am able to confer with the minority leader, it will be my intention, if he clears it, to bring that bill up on Tuesday.

Now I yield to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. Can the distinguished majority leader give assurance that the reports, as well as the resolutions themselves, will be available tomorrow, which will be Saturday?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The majority leader cannot give that assurance, but he will give the assurance that he will make every effort to see that they are available. If he cannot do that, he will take that into account in scheduling the resolutions for consideration.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am afraid that, tomorrow being Saturday, the resolutions and reports will not be printed in time

for us to consider them before Monday. All I desire is merely a few days—a couple of days, anyway—to look them over. As the Senator knows, there are, I think, 19 of them, and perhaps more, and I should like to have ample opportunity to study them.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator knows of my deep desire to accommodate him at all times.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will indicate that the reports are at the desk and are ready to go to the Printing Office, as the majority leader has indicated.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I express my gratitude to the Chair for his intervention.

#### THE ARAB-ISRAELI PROBLEM

Mr. ELLENDER obtained the floor.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Is the Senate still in the morning hour?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is.

Mr. DIRKSEN. We have gotten far beyond the 2-minute limitation. I think the Chair ought to get back to the rule.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is trying to practice universal good judgment.

Mr. ELLENDER. Should the rule not work both ways?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes. I obtained a special order. I shall be very patient. However, I believe there is a limit beyond which Senators should not go in the morning hour. The distinguished majority leader has suggested the 2-minute rule. It has become 6 minutes and 10 minutes. Certainly it is not quite fair to Senators who are present in the Chamber at the stroke of 12, and who are diligent in their attendance upon the affairs of the Senate, to be compelled, because of a violation of the rule, to give way to Senators who come in later. I shall not be snide about it. However, I think the rule ought to be observed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I quite agree that we ought not to be arbitrary about the 2-minute rule. I encounter this question every time a Senator who is not accustomed to being present during the morning hour enters the Chamber. The Senator from Illinois has been present today during practically the entire morning hour. Generally speaking, if the Senator has been regular in his attendance during the morning hour, he must be aware that we have never, under either leadership, been very rigid in the application of the rule. Upon one occasion Senator Taft attempted to limit statements during the morning hour to 2 or 3 minutes. He tried that for 2 or 3 days, and I believe he finally decided that it would be better not to be too arbitrary in adhering to the limitation.

We have nothing else to do today. The Senate can conclude the morning hour, and then individual Senators will be permitted to speak without limitation.

No Senator has taken more than 6 or 7 minutes during the morning hour. I cannot see that any great damage has been done. I think it is better to maintain a little flexibility than to be too arbitrary. I find that when we try to be arbitrary we usually lose more time than we gain.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I should have availed myself of the flexibility to which the Senator refers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] has been recognized.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I shall not detain the Senate for more than 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana asks unanimous consent to speak for 5 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I have no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have no objection.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I wish to compliment the distinguished junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] for the position taken by him yesterday before the Committee on Foreign Relations. I believe his viewpoint should be followed by the committee; our country and our people deserve a thorough study not only of the proposed resolution, but the background of the circumstances which now prevail in the Middle East, and what effect the President's proposal may have.

Much has happened in the past 12 months to cause the conditions which plague the Middle East. It is my considered judgment that there will be trouble in the Middle East so long as the Israeli-Arab question is not settled. For the past 7 or 8 years we have been making money available to both sides, both to the Arabs and to the Israelis, in the hope that the soothing balm of American dollars would heal the wounds caused by this dispute.

When I visited that area 3 years ago I wrote in my notes, and incorporated in my report—which I filed with the Committee on Appropriations and the Department of State, and other agencies—that the Arab-Israeli problem could not be solved by the United States continuing to furnish money and by attempting to appease both sides.

It was kept a secret as to how the money appropriated for the Middle East was to be distributed among the countries of that area. No one or the Committee on Appropriations was advised as to how much would be allocated to Jordan, Iran, or Israel, in fact, any of the countries of that area. It was feared that trouble and dissatisfaction would follow if each country knew what the other obtained. It seems that the same policy is to be followed with the funds suggested since no one can find out how the proposed funds are to be used. Yet, now, according to the proposed resolution, we are being asked to embark upon a program calling for the expenditure of millions of dollars in that area in addition to the funds now being expended. To my way of thinking it is simply a waste of money. The problem which is the cause of all of this trouble will not be solved by money or gifts. If any-



thing, it will be aggravated by the United States Government furnishing the \$200 million now being requested. In addition, I feel certain that the sum suggested is only a starter.

I express the hope that the committee will go into this proposal and its background in great detail, and that it will try to determine whether or not there is a plan—other than the application of more dollar balm—by which the dispute between the Arab world and Israel can be settled.

Last October it was my privilege to travel through the Middle East by car. I visited Syria, Jordan, and Israel. I had occasion to talk at length with the President of Syria. I also had occasion to talk with a few members of the cabinet of King Hussein of Jordan, who was then on the front, where several of his troops had been killed in one of the recurring border incidents.

Later, on the same trip, I had occasion to talk with Mrs. Golda Meir, who is the Foreign Minister in Israel, and also with Mr. David Ben-Gurion, the Prime Minister of Israel.

Judging from the information which I obtained from those leaders in their respective countries, there is little or no chance at the moment of settling this vexing problem. It strikes me that before any final action on the proposed resolution is taken by the Committee on Foreign Relations, it should develop all available information on all aspects of the dispute between Israel and the Arab countries; it should determine whether it is possible to settle the Arab-Israeli question, and if so, by what means, and under what circumstances a settlement can be achieved.

I repeat that, unless and until that problem is settled, we shall continue to have trouble, serious recurring trouble, in that area. Until the friction between Israel and her Arab neighbors is eliminated, there will continue to be an open invitation to the Russians and other countries behind the Iron Curtain to intercede there, and thus invite the use of armed force which I understand the resolution as submitted envisions. If we eliminate the dispute which now exists between the Arabs and Israel we shall not need this resolution, in my humble judgment.

I am now in the process of writing my report on my visit to that area and other parts of the world. I spent a period of a little over 3 months abroad this past fall, inspecting our foreign aid and information activities.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for an additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator may proceed.

Mr. ELLENDER. I have been checking over my diary, which contains more than 250 typewritten pages. Its preparation required considerable time. I am now in the process of writing my report, country by country. It is my hope that by next week, or not later than the following week, I shall be in a position to file my report with the Committee on

Appropriations and to deliver to the Senate a personal summary of my findings and conclusions.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. First, I wish to thank the Senator for his remarks. I appreciate his endorsement of the effort which the Senator from Arkansas is making to obtain information for the use of the Senate committee and for the use of the Senate, regarding our foreign relations.

In view of the request by the administration that Congress share responsibility for the conduct of our foreign affairs, does it not seem reasonable that we should also share with the administration knowledge of what has taken place and is taking place in this area? That is all the Senator from Arkansas is interested in. We should be informed about the developments which have led to the very distressing condition which causes all of us so much concern.

Mr. ELLENDER. I fully agree with my good friend. I return to the point that I think the committee should also look into every possible angle with respect to this resolution, its background, and conditions in the Middle East with a view toward determining what the root of trouble is, and attempting to solve the problem, not merely treating its symptoms. Of course, we know basically what the difficulty is, but we should endeavor to determine how it developed, and whether or not there are ways and means of solving it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Louisiana has again expired.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Louisiana be allowed 2 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I repeat, I think it is incumbent on the Committee on Foreign Relations to develop all the facts, and, if necessary, to consider ways and means by which the Arab-Israeli problem can be settled, if it can be settled at all.

I, for one, believe that by merely spending more and more millions of dollars we shall not achieve anything constructive; on the contrary, we will only aggravate the situation.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I have one further observation. As the Senator knows, last year the Senate authorized a study of the foreign-aid program by the Committee on Foreign Relations, and appropriated \$300,000 for that purpose. A very large volume of reports has now been received by the committee, and more are in preparation. We have not had an opportunity to read them. I suppose they were prepared in anticipation of this particular problem. I believe that within a very short time the Senate will have before it a great deal of additional information upon which it should be able to pass sound judgment.

Mr. ELLENDER. I merely wish to say to my good friend from Arkansas that I have a number of reports which I shall cheerfully turn over to his committee, if it desires them.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thank the Senator.

#### C. WAYLAND BROOKS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I wish to pay tribute to an old friend, once a Member of the Senate, C. Wayland Brooks, of Illinois.

For some days I have been thinking about my long period of friendship with this fine friend, who departed on the eternal journey at an untimely age.

I presume that the first thing which comes to the minds of his many friends is his distinguished record in the service of his country as a marine. He was wounded many times, and was decorated for valor and gallantry in action not only by his own country but also by the Government of France.

Then there comes to mind his service to the community, State, and Nation, in public life in time of peace. He was a distinguished Member of the Senate.

Then there comes to mind his service to his party, embracing over the years the many efforts he made, against the greatest odds, to carry the torch and preserve the vitality of the political institution to which he was intensely devoted.

All of these activities attest not only his heroism and his willingness to sacrifice life itself for his country but also what I like to refer to as the courage of the commonplace. For this kind of valor in the daily struggles of life there are no medals and no decorations, but it has enshrined him in the hearts of a vast host of friends and associates.

But Wayland Brooks left a far more enduring mark than all this. His life recalls the shining truth which was distilled from the mind of Ralph Waldo Emerson.

On a spring morning 100 years ago Emerson was walking the deserted streets of Concord and then continued his walk along the placid river. Notes on a lecture were quietly incubating in his mind. He thought of his own times and of the departure of his generation from sound principle. He thought of the deviations from basic standards. He thought of slavery, of cruelty, and exploitation.

Then there came into the mind of this great philosopher, on that spring morning, the self-searching questions as to what was, after all, the core of virtue and the real significance of life? What was the noblest contribution an individual could make? What was the real meaning of life and the greatest goal to be achieved?

As the general theme engulfed him, his mental pace quickened and he hastened home to his study to write in short, pithy sentences what was to become his great lecture on self-reliance—a lecture which stirred people for a generation like a clear and certain trumpet call.

And so Emerson wrote:

My life is for itself and not for a spectacle.

He continued:

What I must do is all that concerns me, and not what people think.

Then followed other significant phrases:

Nothing is at last sacred but the integrity of your own mind. \* \* \* Nothing can bring you peace but yourself.

That is a moving phrase—the sacredness of the integrity of one's own mind. There was the real moving force in the life of Wayland Brooks. All who knew him can rise up to attest this durable attribute in his private life and in his public service.

Was he embracing some unpopular cause which elicited sharp criticism? What did it matter? It was conviction which counted. Did some critic malign him for a position he asserted on a public question? It was not important. His life was for itself and not for a spectacle. Did some pliant commentator assail his views and make it appear that he reflected only the thinking of some other person? It was a frothy trifle. It was but an ephemeral opinion. What he must do and say was the only concern. Did some obsequious person riding at the end of history's parade instead of at the head, and venting frustration on those with whom he did not agree, assail him as he took his stand on the challenges of the hour? It was not important. It was only sounding brass.

It was the earnestness in the heart of Wayland Brooks; it was the stoutness in his soul; it was the sacred integrity of his own mind which counted. This is true valor. This is courage. This is self-reliance. This is moral stamina. This is what makes a life endure in the remembrance of his friends and fellow men.

So, Mr. President, as a lifelong friend of the great man who graced the Senate, I salute him as a valiant, self-reliant soldier in war and peace.

Mr. President, I desire now to address myself to another subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CARROLL in the chair). The Senator has the floor.

#### PROVISION FOR CORN BASE ACREAGES

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, today I introduced a farm bill. It is very short, but exceedingly important. In connection with that bill I would remind my colleagues of that entrancing line from Shelley's poem *Ode to the West Wind*: Oh, wind, if winter comes, can spring be far behind?

Mr. President, that is merely another way of saying that in 8 or 10 weeks the plow will go into the fertile soil of the Middle West, and the question now is what will be the planting pattern for the corn farmers?

Let me remind the Senate that on December 11, 1956, the Department of Agriculture, as required by law, submitted to the corn farmers in 894 counties in 24 States the question of whether or not they preferred a base acreage program coordinated with the soil-bank

plan or the acreage allotment program. The vote favoring the corn-base acreage program was 269,185. The vote for the acreage allotment program was 168,295. The number of votes for base acreage was 61.5 percent of the total vote cast and fell short of the two-thirds required by law.

An analysis of the vote is revealing. About one-half of all the votes cast for the acreage-allotment program came from the five States of Kansas, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, and South Dakota.

It appears also that about 75 percent of the farmers who were eligible to vote did not cast a vote. I do not know why. I wish I could ferret their thinking and ascertain why they were indifferent to the referendum on the 11th day of December.

While the number of farmers voting for the acreage-allotment program constituted 38.5 percent of the total vote, this is, in fact, about 9 percent of the total number of corn farmers who were eligible to vote. It is clear also that by a substantial majority of 61.5 percent, the voting corn farmers favored the corn base acreage program.

The net effect of this action is that for the crop year 1957 and for subsequent crop years there will be a corn acreage allotment of 37,288,889 acres. Price supports at the national average of \$1.36 per bushel will be available to those producers who comply with their allotments.

In the noncommercial corn areas the price support level for corn will be 75 percent of the level in the commercial areas. This poses a problem not only for Congress but also for the Department of Agriculture and the farmers of the Middle West. I think something must be done immediately, for if the farmers are going to start to turn the soil in 8 or 10 weeks, they ought to know now pretty well what the planting pattern will be, and whether or not they will be entitled to get the benefits of the soil bank plan and can put 15 percent of their acreage into either the acreage reserve or the conservation reserve. At the present time the farmers are at sea simply because there was not a two-thirds vote of approval of the proposal which was placed before the corn farmers.

In my own State of Illinois the vote was 58,592 in favor of the corn base acreage program or the soil bank program, as against 13,949 who favored the so-called acreage allotment program. But the fact of the matter is that, although more than 80 percent of the farmers of Illinois who voted were in favor of the base acreage program, they are now prevented from getting the benefit of what Congress provided in the Soil Bank Act last year. This is true also of other States, where there was a very substantial vote, and where the farmers favored the base acreage plan.

It appears to me that the simplest approach to the problem is the best, and to that end I ask unanimous consent that the bill which I have introduced may be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 829) to provide for corn base acre-

ages, and other purposes, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 829

A bill to provide for corn base acreages and other purposes

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That notwithstanding any other provision of law—

(1) base acreages (based on a total base acreage for the commercial area of 51 million acres) shall be established as provided in section 103 (b) (1) of the Agricultural Act of 1956 for 1957 and for each subsequent year for which an acreage-reserve program is in effect for corn; and

(2) no acreage allotments shall be in effect for the 1957 and subsequent crops of corn;

(3) subject to subsections (a) and (d) of section 308 of such act, price support shall be made available by Commodity Credit Corporation for the 1957 and subsequent crops of corn at such level as the Secretary determines will assist producers in marketing corn in the normal channels of trade but not encourage the uneconomic production of corn, and further with consideration of the factors set forth in section 401 (b) of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the net effect of the proposal is to give the corn farmers in the commercial corn areas what they voted for by a substantial majority on last December 11.

What the measure does in brief is: First, to discontinue acreage allotments for corn; second, to provide a 51 million acre corn base to enable participation in the soil bank acreage reserve program; third, to furnish price supports at a level which will aid corn farmers in marketing their grain without encouraging the uneconomic production of corn; and fourth, to provide that acreage equal to 15 percent of the corn base acreage be placed in the soil bank as a condition for eligibility for price support. This acreage could be taken out of any cropland on the farm and could be placed in the acreage reserve or the conservation reserve or a combination of both.

I do not believe that the 38 percent who voted in the referendum on December 11, 1956—and who constitute only 9 percent of the corn farmers who were eligible to vote—should by their action prevent the nearly 62 percent from participating in the corn base acreage and soil-bank program. It is a rather extraordinary situation when a minority of the farmers actually voting hold the power to impose a program on the majority against the clearly expressed will of the majority; yet that is precisely the situation which confronts the corn farmer today. I believe that the 80 percent of the corn farmers of Illinois who voted for a corn base acreage and for participation in the soil-bank plan should not be denied the right to participate.

I believe now, as I did when the question was considered on the Senate floor in the previous session of Congress, that if this program can be made effective, it will be of material value in bringing feed grain supplies into better balance with demand, and thereby will benefit not only feed grain producers, but livestock producers, as well.

The matter is extremely urgent. I sincerely trust that the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry will take



immediate cognizance of the problem, and will give it early and sustained attention.

Farm Bureau leaders in the Middle-west corn States have already come together in Chicago and have urged action by Congress so that the corn producers may make their planting plans.

Resolutions were also adopted at the 38th annual convention of the American Farm Bureau Federation, which was held in Miami Beach in December, calling for legislation which will enable corn farmers to participate in a program which is favored by a large majority of the farmers affected.

I talked this morning on this subject with the master of the National Grange, who did not commit himself one way or the other.

I hope the program will have universal endorsement, either in its present form or substantially so, so that it can be consummated at once. If we fail to enact legislation such as that I am proposing, the corn farmers of Illinois and the other States will have to revert to an allotment of 37 million acres; and I fancy they will become pretty vocal and quite articulate if that should happen.

So, Mr. President, I introduce the bill today as a new program in the interest of one of our major farm commodities, in the hope that it will commend itself to the thinking of the Department of Agriculture.

#### BIPARTISAN FARM POLICY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I was very much pleased to hear the comments of the able and distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] concerning corn base acreages.

I agree with him that perhaps the most pressing farm problem confronting Congress is the necessity for a more realistic corn program in which farmers can afford to participate. Yet we are still waiting to learn what the administration proposes.

Every Senator from the corn-producing States, regardless of political affiliation, is concerned with getting something done. We have a right to expect some views to be made known by the Department of Agriculture.

Perhaps some of the delay has been occasioned by the rather regrettable action of the Secretary of Agriculture in approaching the matter as purely a partisan, political problem, rather than as a serious economic problem which concerns all of us.

Mr. President, on many, occasions spokesmen for the present administration in the executive branch have talked about farm problems not being partisan problems, and have given lip service to the need for a bipartisan approach to the solution of such problems.

Some of us have had to point out from time to time that there is substantial bipartisan opposition to the administration's farm policies—and too much of the partisanship is emanating from the administration's own backyard.

I sincerely regret that the opening of a new session of Congress was marred right off the reel by a flagrant example of the Secretary of Agriculture's own

unwillingness to practice the bipartisan-ship he has preached.

Let me assure Senators that it gives me no personal pleasure to appear on the floor of the Senate so often in criticism of Secretary of Agriculture Benson. Unfortunately, his acts or his lack of action leave me no other course in properly fulfilling my responsibility of seeking to protect the vast agricultural interests of the State of Minnesota, which are the major economic factors in the State.

Before the 85th Congress opened, in discussing publicly some of the challenges we faced as we approached a new session with divided leadership between the executive and legislative branches of our Government, I expressed the hope that people of good faith in both parties would put the public's interest above partisanship in seeking to find proper solutions to some of our pressing problems.

On December 11, in an address before more than 6,000 farmers in the City Auditorium of St. Paul, I voiced my hopes for this session by saying, in part:

Many of us in the Democratic Party—and proud to be Democrats—stand ready to work shoulder to shoulder with enlightened Republicans to achieve the progress America so urgently needs, and to make the dream of democracy's fulfillment come true for all Americans.

Our President has publicly recognized the need for redirection of the Republican Party from some of its paths of the past. He has called for a new brand of modern Republicanism.

Accepting each other in good faith, as Americans first and partisans second, there is no reason there cannot be enough amongst us who share liberal convictions, Democrat or Republican, to work together toward hammering out a constructive forward-looking program of progress for all America.

It was in that spirit that I had hoped to approach farm legislation this year. And it is still in that spirit that I feel compelled to object to the Secretary of Agriculture's rather contemptuous disregard for the fact that the agricultural committees the 85th Congress are under Democratic chairmanship, and to object to his completely partisan approach to a problem that crosses party lines.

On January 2, the United States Department of Agriculture issued a mimeographed note to correspondents announcing that the Secretary of Agriculture had, on that morning, met "with 15 members of the Senate and House Committees on Agriculture who had been invited by the Secretary to discuss legislative matters which should be considered by the new Congress."

It then listed the names of those present—with not a Democrat among them. The chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was not included. Neither was the chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture.

The release said most of the time was devoted to the corn problems, and added:

There was general agreement that legislation which would rectify the present situation should be enacted as early as possible.

That was on January 2. So far as I can determine, whatever was agreed upon at the meeting still has not been made known to the chairman of our

congressional Committees on Agriculture and Forestry, charged with responsibility for farm legislation.

Mind you, Mr. President, this was not a release from the Republican National Committee. It was an official release from the Department of Agriculture, supposedly representing us all, and serving all of us. Secretary Benson is welcome, of course, to hold partisan conferences with members of his own party in the Congress. But it might have been a far more prudent course for him to include the chairman of the congressional committees in any conference on the legislative program he hopes to get enacted, or at least tell them about what transpired.

The release adds, quoting Secretary Benson:

I am sure a good basis has been laid for cooperation between the Department of Agriculture and the Members of Congress.

Apparently, Mr. Benson does not recognize there is anyone in Congress but Republicans. Mr. President, perhaps we should inform him. Perhaps we should send a delegation to inform him that the Democrats have organized the Congress, and have a majority on the committees handling his proposed legislation. It might be well for the Secretary of Agriculture to recognize that if proposed legislation is to be passed by Congress, votes on both sides of the aisle in this Chamber will be required.

Mr. President, this is a regrettable situation, but the farmers cannot be allowed to suffer because of it. I can understand how any committee chairman would have a right to be indignant over such disregard of his responsibilities. Yet the corn producers cannot be penalized just because of the Secretary's narrow attitude. We are still awaiting the recommendations Secretary Benson talked about in that optimistic release on January 2, but we cannot wait much longer.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a copy of a letter I have sent Secretary Benson, in which I voice the hope that we can get those recommendations some time next week.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### EXHIBIT A

JANUARY 24, 1957.

The Honorable EZRA TAFT BENSON,  
Secretary of Agriculture,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Every Member of Congress from corn-producing areas has been awaiting some indication of your Department's recommendations for changes needed in the corn program this year.

Quite frankly, we and the farmers vitally concerned had expected some administration viewpoint to be outlined immediately to the new Congress so we could get to work on developing a workable program for this year.

The state of the Union message indicated that recommendations for farm legislation would be in the budget message. In his budget message, the President said he had recommended changes in the corn program. But no one, apparently, knows what those recommendations are.

From various sources we understand your Department has been working on a corn proposal, but it seems to be kept under wraps.

I regret that you apparently chose to approach this economic situation strictly from a partisan standpoint, by inviting only Republican members of the Senate and House Agriculture Committees down to the Department to talk it over with you, and excluding the chairmen of the two committees in Congress whose responsibility it will be to guide action on any changes.

I understand you have accepted the invitation of our Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to appear before us next Tuesday morning. The purpose of this letter is to express the hope that you will be able, at that time, to definitely outline your Department's recommendations on a more realistic corn program for this and subsequent years, which will afford corn growers enough opportunity to earn an adequate income so that more widespread participation in the program can be achieved. I feel it would be neglect of a pressing problem to further delay making known your views on this corn situation, so that Congress will have time to give ample consideration to such recommendations along with others originating from among its own members.

Sincerely,

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point the full release from the Department of Agriculture on January 2, to which I have referred.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### EXHIBIT B

##### UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,

Washington, January 2, 1957.

Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson met in his office this morning with 15 members of the Senate and House Committees on Agriculture who had been invited by the Secretary to discuss legislative matters which should be considered by the new Congress. Present were: Senators AIKEN, THYE, HICKENLOOPER, MUNDT, and WILLIAMS. Representatives present were: ANDRESEN, HILL, HOEVEN, HARVEY, BELCHER, MCINTIRE, WILLIAMS, HARRISON, ARENDS, and SIMPSON of Illinois. Christopher Sylvester, secretary to Senator YOUNG, also attended. Most of the time was devoted to corn problems.

Concern was expressed by the Secretary and Members of Congress regarding the corn program. Excessive corn production, low prices, undue stimulation of livestock production, and inadequate soil-bank participation for corn all are a likelihood, the group agreed.

"Cheap feed grain means more and cheaper livestock," said Secretary Benson. "We need a program for corn that will assure reasonable prices and the opportunity for a successful soil bank."

There was general agreement that legislation which would rectify the present situation should be enacted as early as possible. There was also general approval that the approach should be along the lines voted by a substantial majority of corn farmers in the recent referendum. There was a discussion of the possibility of providing a price-support floor for corn for the duration of the soil-bank acreage reserve.

"We were in general agreement," said the Secretary, "that legislative action should be taken, and we agreed that we are concerned not only with corn but with the whole feed grain-livestock balance."

"We discussed a number of other important legislative items which should come before the Congress. Among these were the need for extending Public Law 480, the need for operating the soil bank in such a manner as to reduce the total harvested acreage of the country, and the need for re-

search to find new crops, new uses, and new markets. I am sure a good basis has been laid for cooperation between the Department of Agriculture and the Members of Congress. We shall have additional meetings with members of the Agricultural Committees on matters of legislation and administration. It is anticipated that the President's message to Congress on January 10 will deal also with these problems.

"I am looking forward to our later meetings with members of the committees," the Secretary stated. "Our discussions this morning were frank and constructive. I am sure that the harmony and agreement evident today will continue to be mutually helpful and, most important, of still further benefit to our farmers."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, because it outlines my own attitude toward both agricultural and other bills during this period of divided control between the executive and legislative branches, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, the text of the address to which I have referred, which I delivered before the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association, at St. Paul, Minn., on December 11, 1956.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### EXHIBIT C

##### FULFILLING AMERICA'S PROMISE

(Address by Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY at annual meeting of Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association, St. Paul, Minn., December 11, 1956)

It's always good to be back with the GTA. It is an impressive honor to be invited to address this inspiring gathering for the fourth consecutive year.

I'm proud of your friendship and trust, for you are the firmly imbedded roots upon which democracy depends to survive.

Democracy needs such firm roots today, to withstand challenges of our time.

Perhaps you underestimate your own importance.

Alone, you might be a voice crying in the wilderness in the continuing struggle for human justice and equality. Together, your cooperative efforts exemplify democracy in action, and have a significant impact upon the economic and sociological trends of our lifetime.

We urgently need your effective voice, your courageous leadership, your boldness of vision. We need it to keep ever alive our continuing struggle for greater fulfillment of America's promise of human justice and equality. We need it not for our own sake alone, but for the sake of all mankind.

Perhaps you will pardon me, tonight, if I am inclined to look at some of our pressing domestic problems of agricultural policy in the light of the critical situation which confronts our troubled world. I have just come to you from sitting as a United States delegate to the General Assembly of the United Nations. I must return to that world forum tomorrow, to renew our efforts to preserve peace with honor in a world shaken by unrest and turmoil and open rebellion against oppression and tyranny.

Crises in international affairs may seem somewhat remote to the immediate urgency of economic problems confronting you as farmers, and quite properly occupying your attention at this great annual conclave.

Yet, they are not so remote. Indeed, they are closely interrelated.

On the world front, we are faced with a struggle between moral right and military might.

On the domestic front, we are faced with a struggle between human values and economic might.

We can hardly win one, while ignoring the other.

Neither military might nor economic might are of themselves necessarily evil. They become so only when used without restraint to exploit human resources, without regard for basic, inherent moral rights of human justice and equality.

When that happens, either can create oppression and tyranny.

Yet properly harnessed and used for the benefit of mankind, these same forces can create good instead of evil. Properly used, they can contribute to fulfillment of America's promise of opportunity, equality, and security—not for us alone, but for the world about us.

Our success or failure in controlling these forces will be measured by our willingness to keep uppermost in our minds concern about our fellow man, at home or abroad.

We must really care about people. We must value human resources above material wealth. We must at all times seek justice, rather than selfish advantage.

There can be no double standard. We must achieve fulfillment of America's promise at home, to effectively offer it as a symbol of hope to the rest of the world.

This same parallel was drawn, and these some thoughts were effectively and dramatically expressed, in a significant address 14 years ago, in another time of crisis—when our country was fighting a war to save freedom and civilization as we know it.

It was entitled, appropriately enough, "The American Promise."

It was an address by one of the alltime great voices in the continuing crusade for human justice and equality of opportunity in rural America—a powerful voice for the real meaning of democracy then, and a powerful voice for the real meaning of democracy today. It was an address by your own general manager of the GTA, my friend and yours, M. W. "Bill" Thatcher.

Prophetically, that address looked beyond winning the war to winning the peace that must come, and charted a course for fulfillment of the American promise that could still provide useful guideposts today.

I hope that address can be brought out of the Archives, Bill, and be redistributed. We need its message today, to emphasize the continuing nature of mankind's struggle for progress—and the necessity of keeping our sights firm on just and honorable goals, whatever problems we may encounter.

Democracy is still on trial in the court of world opinion. All mankind is the jury.

What we do to prove its effectiveness may determine our fate, and the fate of all freedom in the world, for generations to come. What we fail to do, to prove democracy is best for the least of us, may influence the fate of all of us.

If we are to inspire hope in areas of the world grasping for hope—if we are to fulfill our destiny of moral leadership in a world sadly needing such leadership—then we must first keep faith with our own people, and make sure democracy works for all.

All the wealth of America, all of our skyscrapers in Wall Street, all of our fancy kitchen gadgets and fine automobiles are not enough to convince the awakening peoples of many underdeveloped areas of the world that democracy offers them the same hope and promise.

They know we are a wealthy land; they are more interested in knowing how we share that wealth among our people. They know we as a country are rich in resources, material possessions, and know-how. But they are more interested in knowing our attitude toward people, about the concern we have for human values.

They are more interested in knowing how farm families are doing out in the Midwest than in knowing how stockbrokers are doing on Wall Street. That's understandable, because more of them are farm families. They



are more interested in knowing how workers in our factories and our cities are doing than in knowing how much profit our corporations are making. That's understandable, too, because more of them must toil for existence than can ever hope to live off the toil of others.

Whatever we do to make democracy more effective at home strengthens our hand abroad, in seeking to build a better world of brotherhood and peace. Whatever we do to prove democracy offers adequate economic opportunity for all of our own people is more effective in combating the insidious inroads of communism than all the shouting from the housetops could ever hope to achieve.

Perhaps we have been too smug about democracy's achievements, and too unwilling to look at our own weaknesses and shortcomings. We might fool ourselves, but we're not fooling others.

It's rather difficult to boast about the great ideals of democracy to an African, only to have him read in our newspapers about a white minister being beaten up for escorting colored students to an American school.

It's rather difficult to boast about the prosperity under our free enterprise system to a visiting official from India, only to have him ask why so many farmers are going broke out here in the Midwest.

We better start practicing what we preach, if we expect to assert moral leadership in the world. We better make democracy work for all, if we expect it to survive in a restless world where many facing hardship are no longer complacent to watch a privileged few enjoy the blessings of plenty.

That's why agriculture's problems are not yours alone.

The fact that farm families are not sharing proportionately in the Nation's general prosperity—the fact that the economic imbalance of agriculture contrasted to other segments of our economy is continuing to grow worse instead of being corrected—is a weak link in democracy's armor that should be everyone's concern.

For that reason I welcome this chance, tonight, to look back briefly over what we have been trying to do toward wiping out that imbalance, to appraise our successes and failures together, and perhaps to reset our sights on the tasks still ahead.

We have been engaged for years in a period of great national debate on farm policy. The end is not yet in sight. Yet we would be wrong today in reckoning our success or failure by the current economic situation in agriculture alone, without considering also where we might be had we never made the fight.

By the very intensity of that national debate, we have emphasized and underlined the vital economic importance of agriculture. We have not resolved all of our problems, but we have increased the public's awareness that all have a stake in them being resolved.

We have exercised our right in a democracy to dissent and debate, and have bolstered democracy in the process by making more people aware that every voice counted. For years our annual meetings have been constructive forums for crystallizing views of Midwest agriculture, and making those views felt in policymaking functions of our Government, both executive and legislative. For the past 3 years, I have been privileged to be a participant in this democratic process of exchanging views. Together, we have sought a common ground for making better progress toward our accepted mutual goal of parity of income for our farm families.

Once again that is our purpose. I need not occupy your time or mine recounting statistics to emphasize what your own pocketbooks and bank accounts tell you best. I do not feel it is necessary to further document trends and events of the past 3 years to justify what I have discussed with you in

years gone by. The facts speak for themselves, and it serves no constructive purpose to indulge myself in a few "I told you so's."

Neither do I feel it necessary to recount my own efforts in your behalf over that span of years. By now, I'm quite sure, most of you are familiar with my convictions about agriculture, and the effort I have put forth to exemplify them. I shall leave it to you to judge my stewardship of the trust you have bestowed upon me.

You know the story of what happened during January, February, and March of 1956. It was another showdown effort in agriculture's long fight for equality—and I believe one of the most historic episodes in that long struggle.

We developed, and enacted, a good farm bill—in the face of many obstacles.

It was rejected by the President, upon the recommendation of Secretary of Agriculture Benson.

That was their right—and it is their responsibility for the consequences.

We didn't give up. We did the next best thing we could do—we enacted a new compromise bill they would accept. With all its weaknesses and omission, it was better than nothing for you.

Our fight—your fight—wasn't entirely in vain. Without the effort put forth to dramatize the seriousness of agriculture's plight, and expose many of the propaganda myths surrounding it, you would be even worse off today.

However, my purpose tonight is to emphasize your role in this economic struggle, not my own.

Throughout the past 3 years, midwest agriculture has made its voice and influence effectively heard and felt in the policymaking process of our democracy. And no force has been greater in mobilizing and effectively presenting the voice of midwest agriculture than your Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association.

Without the persistence and alertness of your able leadership, far less heed would have been paid to your economic troubles.

Without the forceful mobilization of sentiment by the GTA, midwest agriculture would have been faced with an even faster skid down the economic ladder.

Without your support, we could never have won many of our closely contested farm votes in the Senate, nor emerged with the few gains we were able to retain after vetoing of the farm bill we worked for together.

From my vantage point in Washington, I have had ample opportunity to judge the effectiveness, or lack of effectiveness, of spokesmen for American agriculture. And I want you to know tonight that no witness before us has earned more respect, nor carried more weight and influence, than your Bill Thatcher—and no organization has more capably and dramatically presented its case than has your GTA.

Whether they agree or disagree with his views, no one in or out of Congress can successfully challenge the sincerity of Bill Thatcher's convictions, nor his dedication to his purpose of serving you and other family farmers of America. In my opinion, no man could have more effectively carried forward the continuing uphill fight in your behalf than Bill Thatcher has done and is still doing, with an amazing vigor that belies his years.

Together with Jim Patton, of the National Farmers Union, his guidance and counsel have made a tremendous contribution toward sound liberal progress for our democracy.

While down through the years Bill Thatcher and the GTA have made many able and effective presentations to the Congress, I'm convinced none was more successful, more timely, nor more convincing than the GTA family farm survey laid before Congress this year—just at the critical hour

we were confronted with serious decisions concerning the future of every American farmer.

I want to commend all of you tonight, officers and members alike, for the valuable contribution of that factfinding study. It provided the evidence we needed, to carry forward your objectives. Its findings could not be refuted. It cleared the air of myths and propaganda, and laid a firm foundation of fact upon which we could base our appeal for more just treatment of farm families in our economy.

I could not pass this opportunity, tonight, to pay the deserved tributes I have voiced to your organization and its leadership, for its effective service to all agriculture. Yet I do so for a more serious purpose than mere compliment, or just recognition where recognition is due.

I have tried to emphasize the influence you wield because I recognize it as a force for good, a force for progress, a force for making democracy work—and above all, a force that must not be stilled nor allowed to wither and die.

This is no time for retreat. Neither is it a time to permit ourselves to be diverted into only rearguing the past.

However great the challenges and problems, it is a time to keep moving ahead. With our eyes holding steady to our goals of justice and equality for farm families, we must continue seeking and embracing more ways of achieving those goals.

I call upon you tonight to press forward with renewed faith and renewed vigor, toward the fulfillment of America's promise—for farm people, as well as for all people.

Because they are right and just, our goals need not be changed, nor our sights lowered.

The underlying concept of parity income for America's farm families—of equality of economic opportunity, of the right to share fully and fairly in our Nation's progress and prosperity—that concept must become an accepted fact in our national life.

We must refuse to retreat from that common objective. Without it, we face an unfair and unjust double standard within our democracy, that denies the same fulfillment of America's promise to all.

We can and must move together toward our goals by every means at our command, strengthening agriculture's bargaining power until it can compete with full equality in an expanding economy. If we find some paths to our goals blocked, our challenge is to find new paths—and more of them—bringing us to the same end objectives.

The American people have recently exercised their right, under a democracy, to select the people of their choice to lead them for the next 4 years. By the free choice of a democracy, they have chosen a Republican President, yet given a vote of confidence to the Democratic Party in Congress.

In returning a popular President to office they have refused, for the first time in over a hundred years, to return his unpopular party to office with him. Presumably, they did so because they liked his personality, but preferred our programs.

My remarks are not intended to be partisan. We simply must look realistically at where we stand today and what the election should mean to us.

It would be tragically wrong and dangerous for either party now to ignore or misinterpret the mandate of the people—to Democrats and Republicans alike.

That mandate makes clear that initiative for development of a new and effective legislative program for the 85th Congress must be shared between the Democratic Party and the President, and each must accept the sober responsibility of measuring up such a program against the criteria of proving to the world that democracy works for all our people—for farmer and city man alike, for young and old, for rich and for poor.

Regardless of the overwhelming proportions of the President's victory, it would be a sad mistake for either the President or the Republican Party to accept that vote as a simultaneous stamp of approval for his agricultural policies of the past term.

Most objective observers without partisan bias agree that the biggest defection from President Eisenhower was in the Nation's farm areas.

The shift of farm vote away from the President in traditionally Republican areas should at least encourage the executive branch to reappraise its farm policies and to cooperate with the Congress toward developing new and better answers to the serious economic problems that continue to plague farm families.

Perhaps it is too much to hope for a complete reversal of the administration's policies, particularly if Ezra Taft Benson is retained as Secretary of Agriculture.

But farm people at least have the right to expect, and to insist upon, open minds and fair consideration by the executive branch of further improvements in our farm program, regardless of whether they are of Democratic or Republican origin.

There is much that needs to be done, and much that can be done, despite the divided authority in Washington.

We need to reexamine the soil bank, after its first year in operation, to see where either the law itself or administration of it needs to be corrected and strengthened.

We need to see what can be done piecemeal, commodity by commodity, to strengthen farm income protection, if we cannot achieve it by overall revision of our basic farm legislation.

We shall most certainly take a careful new look at our corn program, in the light of the outcome of today's farmer balloting.

We can, and should, explore further bolstering of feed markets by shifting income-protection efforts toward end products using such feed, such as offering premium incentives of lighter weight hogs.

We must at all cost protect farmers' cooperatives from new attacks that would further undermine agriculture's bargaining power and deprive farm people of an effective means of working together to help themselves.

We may need tightened safeguards against unrestrained and price-depressing dumping of Government-held stocks of feed grains in the domestic markets, under the misnomer of getting rid of the surplus. We must make clear that any cheap feed philosophy can only lead to lowered livestock income, adding to the vicious downward squeeze on all farm income.

We must seek ways to increase consumption, instead of just displacing existing sales by Government domination of markets.

We have such opportunities at home and abroad, both through a domestic food-stamp plan to improve dietary standards of our own underprivileged people and through use of food to promote economic development in underdeveloped areas of the world.

May I say in passing that recent international developments should give cause for pause and reconsideration, among those who have deplored our abundance as a curse instead of a blessing. In a world of turmoil, food and fiber can be a more effective weapon of peace than guns or dollars. Our abundance offers us tremendous opportunities to prove democracy's humanitarian intent, and our concern for the well being of all people everywhere.

For example, how better could we show our deep concern for the plight of courageous freedom fighters escaping from Hungary, than to offer quickly to provide the food and fiber needed for their sustenance to any country offering them safe haven?

It is not my intent tonight to try and spell out all the ways we might move forward toward our goal of parity for family-farm income. I only want to emphasize that

there are still many paths open, and make clear the urgency of exploring them all.

To you that urgency, above all else, is protecting your own livelihood, and providing more adequately for the needs of your families.

But to all America, that urgency is strengthening of our democracy, and proving it works for all. In that respect, the challenge that confronts us in agriculture also confronts us in other aspects of our national life.

We must prove democracy can provide the answer to all such challenges.

Communism cannot be wiped out by mere indignation against its abuses and outrages. It can only be crushed by effectively proving a free people under a democracy can better cope with their social and economic problems, and can better translate into reality the hope and aspirations of all people for a better life.

Communism maintains that social wrongs can be corrected only by violence. Democracy has proved that social justice can be achieved through peaceful change—and we must constantly continue to exemplify that proof before the world.

We can't do it by timidity, or complacency, or self-satisfaction with the status quo as always being "good enough."

We can do it only by recapturing the boldness and zeal of our forefathers, and moving aggressively forward on an enlightened, liberal program of new social gains, new progress, new opportunity, new goals that stir the imaginations and hopes of all people everywhere.

That's the challenge we face, as we approach a new session of Congress with divided leadership between the executive and legislative branches of our Government.

Yet that division need not discourage us, for that challenge exists for Republicans as well as Democrats—and the urgency for bold answers must rise above all partisanship, for the sake of our own country and the sake of the world.

I want to assure you tonight that many of us in the Democratic Party—and proud to be Democrats—stand ready to work shoulder to shoulder with enlightened Republicans to achieve the progress America so urgently needs, and to make the dream of democracy's fulfillment come true for all Americans.

Our President has publicly recognized the need for redirection of the Republican Party from some of its paths of the past. He has called for a new brand of modern republicanism.

Accepting each other in good faith, as Americans first and partisans second, there is no reason there cannot be enough amongst us who share liberal convictions, Democrat or Republican, to work together toward hammering out a constructive, forward-looking program of progress for all America.

We urgently need such a liberal coalition in American public life today, with the courage to assert leadership for the common good, and the boldness to break tradition or ties with the past where necessary to achieve our common goals.

We need not look far for issues where the demand for action in the public's interest is far more urgent than mere partisanship or political advantage.

The plight of agriculture is but one of such challenges. As farm families with deep concern for America, you also have a vital stake in all the rest.

We must at long last move aggressively toward eliminating discrimination of all kinds, whether economic or because of race, color, or creed. There can be no second-class citizenship in a democracy. We must wipe out the inequities and injustices of our immigration laws that belie the humanitarian spirit of our democracy. We must improve our refugee-relief legislation, to make meaningful to the rest of the world the symbol of our Statue of Liberty.

By all means, we must provide more adequate school facilities for our children and generations yet to come, knowing the future fate of our democracy must rest on an informed and understanding citizenry.

We must prove democracy has a heart, by more adequately providing for the aged and handicapped in our midst. We must safeguard ourselves and generations yet unborn by moving ahead on medical research and in assuring more adequate medical care and hospital facilities, particularly in rural areas.

We must see that adequate housing is made available within the means of our citizens, and must stimulate and encourage slum clearance and urban redevelopment in the rotting hearts of our great cities.

We must continually expand our horizons of possible economic growth, assure creation of new jobs to match our population growth, and provide ample opportunity for independent business to keep alive the real spirit of competitive free enterprise against the inroads of monopolistic concentration of industrial wealth and power.

We must protect the great heritage of our natural resources for the benefit of all our people, conserving them against commercial exploitation that would rob future generations of their birthright and risk the future of our country.

And by all means, certainly not the least of our goals for America must be preservation of the family farm pattern of agriculture, with equality of economic opportunity through whatever bargaining power necessary to achieve full parity of income. Certainly we as a Nation cannot rightly take pride in a supposed prosperity that ignores the economic plight of agriculture and relegates our farm families to the most ruthless regimentation of all—the regimentation of poverty.

These are basic, fundamental goals we must achieve, regardless of who is in the White House, and who is in the Congress.

It is an American program, for which all Americans should cry out for leadership and action.

For these things we must do, to make the American promise come true.

**Mr. HUMPHREY.** Mr. President, because it is typical of farm reaction in the corn belt to Mr. Benson's partisan approach to proposed legislation this year, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a transcript from a GTA radio newscast carried over 11 midwestern radio stations on Monday, January 7.

There being no objection, the transcript was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### EXHIBIT D

##### GTA DAILY RADIO ROUNDUP

Good afternoon. You'll be hearing a lot—in the next few months—about a bipartisan approach—in Congress—to the various problems which beset the Nation—and that includes the farm problem. What does bipartisan mean? Simply a true effort—on the part of both Democrats and Republicans—to put their heads together, and work out sound solutions.

Now farmers are wondering which way the new Congress will go. A true bipartisan effort could write a decent farm program—and a bipartisan attitude in the White House could put the President's signature on such a bill. Congress wrote such a bipartisan bill last year—but the President didn't see eye-to-eye with Congress—and vetoed the bill. Farmers wonder whether he'd do the same thing again.

Certain legislation deserves the support of both political parties—and of the White House—too. We're thinking of a bill dropped in the hopper by Representative



GEORGE MCGOVERN, of South Dakota, 5 minutes after he was sworn in. The former editor of the South Dakota Union Farmers—Bob Nelson—who's on McGOVERN's staff now—says in a telegram to the GTA radio newsroom, that the bill was written in cooperation with other Congressmen. It calls for an investigation of the high cost of living and widening margins between farm and consumer prices. It would set up a permanent seven-man committee—to make recommendations for increasing prices to farmers—and lowering food prices to consumers. The bill also asks Congress to declare a national policy of abundant production with fair returns to farmers.

Will measures like this get bipartisan support? We hope so—but early indications from the executive branch of the Government are not good. For example, President Eisenhower's Secretary of Agriculture—Ezra Benson—has called a conference of 15 members of the Senate and House Agriculture Committees. They'll meet in his office tomorrow—Tuesday. According to newspaper reports—all 15 are Republicans. Benson left out the 27 Democratic members on the two farm committees.

Newsmen interpret Benson's action as a rejection of the plea for a two-party coalition to work out the farm problem—made by Democratic Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, of Minnesota—when he spoke at the GTA annual meeting in St. Paul last December.

Congressmen, of course, will resent Mr. Benson's unfortunate partisanship. We report this to you today—because Secretary Benson may have opened an early rupture—in bipartisan efforts to work out decent farm legislation in this session of Congress. We'll keep you posted on developments in Washington—as they take place—on this daily radio program—a public service of GTA—the co-op way.

### THE YOUTH OPPORTUNITY PROGRAM

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I turn now to another matter. Today I am introducing a bill providing for a youth opportunity program. It is a program on which I have worked for well over a year, in consultation with a number of advisers throughout the country. I believe that if this bill is enacted, the program could be of considerable help to the young people of the Nation.

Therefore, Mr. President, I should like to discuss a few aspects of this area of national interest. It deserves the most dedicated attention from us all.

The problems and requirements of our Nation's youth confront us with a mounting challenge and responsibility which we can no longer afford to shirk. Public planning and public action are urgently required if America is to continue to provide an adequate opportunity for self-development to its youth, regardless of their race, religion, family economic background, geographical residence, or comparative abilities.

It has always been a central point of my political and social philosophy that the two critical periods in the life of every American are his youth and his old age. In recent sessions we in Congress have acted—although not as comprehensively as I would have liked; nevertheless, we have acted—to improve our social security system and extend other existing legislation designed to fulfill our responsibility to our elderly people. We have much more to do, and

I trust that at this session of Congress we shall proceed with that business. But we have postponed long overdue attention to the subject of what we, as a people, can do to assist the youth of our Nation in their crucial, formative years.

Mr. President, we need only read the daily newspapers to know that there are two fundamental divisions of the all-encompassing problems today facing American youth. The division is largely between problems of an academic nature, on the one hand, and problems of a nonacademic nature, on the other. In both areas, legislative action has now become imperative if we are to escape from a condition which is already beginning to take on the dimensions of a national catastrophe.

We need only consider the wide range of problems facing us in the academic field to know how serious the challenge there is: able youths prevented by economic hardship from attending institutions of higher education; the soaring enrollments which, despite the financial lack, are flowing from an increased population in the younger age brackets; the central problem of school construction; the serious deficiency in the quality and quantity of our teachers; and the financial crippling of many of our academic institutions under the load of the new demands placed upon them.

Mr. President, those are some of the academic challenges which lie before us and are plaguing us at this very moment.

When we turn to the other, non-academic, side of the coin, the challenge is equally obvious: How to provide recreational facilities for youthful activities in healthy surroundings; how to bridge the gap between high school and employment for those who are not going on to further education; how to explore new methods for the rehabilitation of delinquent youths and for the gradual elimination of the causes of delinquency by striking at its economic and psychological roots.

Mr. President, we Americans of adult age talk a great deal about our young people, but we do far too little about the subject we discuss. As a father, a husband, a citizen, and a public official, I have a genuine concern over the lack of proper attention to the problems of America's young men and young women. I am particularly concerned when I know that the young people of the Nation are our greatest natural resource. This great natural resource is receiving far too little attention.

Apparently we are more interested in the erosion of land than we are in the erosion of people. Mr. President; I do not mean to indicate in any way that the erosion of our land is not indeed a serious problem. On other occasions I have said that a nation that permits its land to be eroded and its young people to suffer from inadequate opportunity is a nation which is doomed to trouble and ultimately to suffer calamity. I am hopeful, however, that the United States of America will place its emphasis first upon its youth and upon the possibilities for achievement by young men and young women in whatever line of endeavor they may wish to dedicate their lives.

Mr. President, I have been disturbed, and I may even say I have been tormented, by the urgency of these matters, as I know most of my colleagues have been. During recent months I have tried to consider the possibilities of a broadly based legislative approach which would attempt, in however inadequate a way, to meet some of the varied aspects of the problems I have just mentioned. I certainly do not want it to appear that I believe that legislation is the entire answer. It is not. All that legislation can do is supplement and help. The proposed legislation to which I refer is designed to strengthen community activities in the field of youth opportunity. Legislation can be helpful to mothers and fathers in their work of providing better homes and better community life for their young men and young women. But legislation can be helpful in the field of education, and I am going to speak in the Senate as long as I have the strength to do so, in behalf of a program of expanded educational opportunities for young Americans.

It is almost inconceivable that this Nation can spend more on commercial recreation than it does on education. But it does. It is almost inconceivable that this Nation can spend more on control of diseases of plants and animals than it spends on control of diseases of human beings; but that is what it does. It seems to me almost inconceivable that the Federal Government can spend more for the reclamation of soil than it spends for the reclamation of mankind; it does. Someday perhaps we shall put first things first, and when that day arrives some of the problems we now face may fade away into insignificance.

Mr. President, I am about to send to the desk six measures comprising what I should like to call a youth opportunity program. I offer it as the beginning of an answer. I do not for a moment suggest that it is original or is profound, and surely it is not beyond criticism. This program is but a beginning. It is a sincere attempt soberly made to solve a tremendous problem.

I solicit criticism and amendment, and I offer this program only in an effort to break what seems to be an intolerable logjam, a logjam which must be broken in the interest of both the immediate and long-term needs of our country.

Let me now turn to the first division I mentioned, the situation facing us in the educational sphere. I am convinced that Walter Lippmann, distinguished American columnist and political commentator, did not underestimate the problem facing us when he recently declared in words which I should like to quote at some length:

We have to do in the educational system something very like what we have done in the Military Establishment during the past 15 years. We have to make a breakthrough to a radically higher and broader conception of what is needed and of what can be done. Our educational effort today, what we think we can afford, what we think we can do, how we feel entitled to treat our schools and our teachers—all of that—is still in approximately the same position as was the military effort of this country before Pearl Harbor.

In 1940 our Armed Forces were still at a level designed for a policy of isolation in this hemisphere and of neutrality in any war across the two oceans. Today, the Military Establishment has been raised to a different and higher plateau, and the effort that goes into it is enormously greater than it was in 1940.

Our educational effort, on the other hand, has not yet been raised to the plateau of the age we live in. I am not saying, of course, that we should spend \$40 billion on education because we spend that much on defense. I am saying that we must make the same order of radical change in our attitude toward education as we have made in our attitude toward defense.

Those are the words of Mr. Lippmann, Mr. President, and they are a remarkably effective statement of the problem of education which is before us today.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am always happy to yield to my friend from Michigan.

Mr. POTTER. First, I should like to commend the Senator for bringing this subject to the Senate floor today for discussion. I sincerely hope the committees to which the bills will be referred will give prompt consideration to the measures.

I wonder if the Senator will agree with me that the concern he has, which I am sure many Americans throughout the country share, is over the use of brainpower by our young people today. Reports coming to us from great and learned men show that the Soviet Union, through the force of dictatorship, can channel the brainpower of men into the various categories into which the state may want it channeled. In this country there is a waste of the brainpower of our young men today. Unless a young man has the economic background, he cannot afford to attend one of our major universities. Perhaps the young man comes from a home whose necessities force him to work early in life. We as a Nation lose more than the individual loses, because we lose the development of his brainpower, which is essential today because of the conflict between free people on the one hand and dictatorial states on the other. We are losing the race in the scientific field because we are not properly using the brainpower of our young people. Does the Senator concur in that statement?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I do concur in the Senator's statements. Those statements are truths that we have simply got to face up to. It is all very well for us to say we hope everything will turn out all right. But is it not amazing how quickly we respond when we hear that the Soviet Union has developed a new plane, or that the Soviet Union has developed a new technique in armament? Yet, when we hear that the Soviet Union is turning out thousands of trained technicians and trained scientists, many thousands more than we are turning out despite our head start, when we hear that kind of news, we say, "Well, that's too bad. It is interesting. It is something alarming, but pardon me while I turn over and take another nap."

What the Senator from Michigan is saying, first, is that we ought not to allow

others to get the advantage over us scientifically, technically, and intellectually. Second, that we should utilize all our resources for our own account. Even if there were no Communists, we should do so. We ought to do it because it is the right thing to do.

In my opinion, one of the challenges we face is what free people can and will do when we ourselves meet these problems. We happen to confront the threat of the Communists on the one hand, who are a challenge to us; but the question should be what we ourselves as free people should do to meet the situation.

Mr. POTTER. Will the Senator yield further for an observation?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I do; indeed.

Mr. POTTER. I am concerned with the problem of arousing greater interest on the part of young people to further their knowledge in the scientific field and offering greater incentives to them. I am working on proposed legislation that will provide for an Academy of Science, which, like our academies for the branches of the armed services, will provide a resource which must be further developed in this country. Perhaps that in a small way will aid in bringing about the training and development of scientists who are so badly needed in our country today.

I wish to commend the Senator for a worthwhile and interesting statement.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator. I shall look forward to his proposals, and study them with great care and interest.

I now continue to read from the remarks of Mr. Lippmann. They express so precisely and concisely what I should like to be able to express that I shall use his words:

We must measure our educational effort as we do our military effort. That is to say, we must measure it not by what it would be easy and convenient to do, but by what it is necessary to do in order that the Nation may survive and flourish. We have learned that we are quite rich enough to defend ourselves, whatever the cost. We must now learn that we are quite rich enough to educate ourselves as we need to be educated.

There is an enormous margin of luxury in this country against which we can draw for our vital needs. We take that for granted when we think of the national defense. From the tragedies and the bitter experience of being involved in wars for which we were inadequately prepared, we have acquired the will to defend ourselves. And, having done that, having acquired the will, we have found the way. We know how to find the dollars that are needed to defend ourselves, even if we are to do without something else that is less vitally important.

In education we have not yet acquired that kind of will. But we need to acquire it, and we have no time to lose. We must acquire it in this decade. For if, in the crucial years which are coming, our people remain as unprepared as they are for their responsibilities and their mission, they may not be equal to the challenge, and if they do not succeed, they may never have a second chance in order to try again.

Mr. President, no matter where we turn the evidences of contemporary life lead us to Mr. Lippmann's conclusion.

American society is deteriorating in the sector most critical for future progress and well-being. The quality of the future depends on education at all levels

and the quality of education depends on its top leadership. Our society is now in a period of rapid change. We are face to face with increasing complexities and hazards, both technical and moral. It is absolutely essential that we bring into education a sufficient share of the highest talent of each generation so that each succeeding generation will be the better prepared to deal with the challenges of its own time.

We can view the problem, if we wish, from the dramatic perspective of our competition with the Soviet Union. Most of us are familiar with the increasingly frightening reports about the serious manpower shortage facing us in the scientific, technical, engineering, and other professional fields. I mention only one—the almost unbelievable statement made last summer by Adm. Lewis Strauss, Chairman of the United States Atomic Energy Commission. Admiral Strauss said:

Last year for all the high schools of the United States, we produced only 125 new teachers of physics. Think of it. Only 125 for 28,000 high schools.

I know a little about this problem, as I have 4 children in school—2 in junior high school, 1 in senior high school, and 1 in elementary school. The chance of any community obtaining teachers in the field of science is becoming more and more remote. Only a few days ago I sat at breakfast with Secretary of the Army Brucker. He told Members of Congress that much of our military strength today is being threatened with complete disintegration because of the inability of the Government to retain in the service people of skill and competence once they have fulfilled their terms of enlistment. The Army of the United States requires brainpower as well as firepower. When a young man receives his education in the Army and learns how to do some of the intricate and complex things that must be done with modern weapons, industry is waiting at that very point to offer him a job.

Educational establishments cannot obtain the services of such people. They cannot pay enough. One of these days we shall be in the situation of not having sufficient manpower in our Military Establishment properly to utilize our complex mechanical equipment, or the necessary manpower in our educational establishments to train the kind of enlightened citizenry we need.

This is only one graphic illustration of what we are up against in the professional manpower shortage. I might add parenthetically, Mr. President, that last fall I requested the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress to prepare a detailed and comprehensive report on the Shortage of Scientific, Engineering, and other Professional Manpower, summarizing and analyzing the numerous and occasionally conflicting statements which have recently been made by various authorities in connection with this problem. I am hopeful that the first half of this report will be available for release within the next 2 or 3 weeks.

I spent 2 years making a study of the shortage of scientific manpower. My re-



port too is being updated, doublechecked and I hope it may be useful in connection with the Library of Congress study.

Mr. President, I am even more concerned about the failure of education than I am about the possibility of an attack in the Middle East. If as many Members of Congress could become excited about what is happening to our educational structure as are excited over hearing Mr. Dulles in the caucus room of the Senate Office Building, we would really be accomplishing something.

We may also, Mr. President, look at the problem from the perspective of the handicap placed on native ability by financial incapacity.

It is estimated by educational experts that there are at the present time more than 150,000 young men and women in the United States who rank in the upper 12 percent of the population's intellectual range, but who cannot go to college because they lack the necessary means.

As everyone knows, the next few years will find us in an even more serious situation as the number of American youths of college age swells to a figure more than 50 percent larger than it is today. Yet, we prepare for these youths by annually spending less on education than we do on alcoholic beverages and cosmetics, and many Americans prepare to meet this nationally serious problem by relying on 19th century thinking and methods. The educational needs of our youth can no longer be considered only as a State or local problem. It is high time that effective cooperation of all governmental units be utilized to face our Nation's educational challenge.

Mr. President, I think it would be startling for many Americans to know that today the Federal Government actually contributes less to the aid of education than it did 60 years ago. In 1895, the Federal Government provided over 5 percent of the funds used nationally for education, while today it supplies only 2.6 percent.

Mr. President, it is a great waste of one of the most valuable resources of our Nation to let our young people with outstanding mental ability be deprived of a college education because of financial difficulties or other reasons. Apart from the increase in individual satisfactions and development resulting from such an expansion of educational opportunities, it is obvious that the future well-being of our entire Nation would be greatly enhanced by this overall enlargement of our national capabilities.

We may also, Mr. President, view this whole problem from the perspective of increased enrollments in the context of decreased State and local capabilities of meeting them.

Recent reports from State after State—and I cite in particular my own State of Minnesota—are typical of the national problem. In Minnesota, earlier this month Governor Freeman's committee on higher education, headed by one of our most distinguished citizens, Mr. Samuel Gale, told the Minnesota Legislature that—

An increase in college enrollment in Minnesota can be expected by 1970 to be some 80 to 100 percent above present enroll-

ments. Soaring enrollments offer no alternative but very substantial increases in public funds for higher education, increases which are needed immediately by all types of public higher education.

The Minnesota report also cites demands for trained scientists and engineers and states that—

The number of graduates from these fields is far from sufficient for local demands.

Every effort should be made to see that opportunity is available for preparation for such work to every Minnesota youth who is qualified.

The rural youth who expects to remain on the farm will need more training than his father, since the entire process of farming now demands considerable technical know-how and business management skill.

The committee called the shortage in teachers "the greatest manpower problem of the State at this time." It pointed out that at present, Minnesota is losing more teachers than it is training.

"The financial rewards of teaching must be brought into line with those of other professions," it stated.

I point out to every father and mother in the galleries, and every Member of this body, that if we have children who are very young, we can rest assured that they will receive a worse education than those who are a little older. We are running short of teachers. We are training fewer teachers every year, to meet an increasing school population. We are putting more and more children in classrooms, with fewer and fewer teachers, and still hoping to have an educated citizenry. It will not work.

I face this problem in my personal life as a father. I resent it, because I am willing to pay the price of good education for our children. As a United States Senator, I think it is high time that I did something to try to rectify the situation, if it is within my power as a public official.

The teacher shortage is the No. 1 national manpower problem. If we have a No. 1 national manpower problem, we ought to do something to solve it. I propose that we do something, partly by means of the proposed legislation which I introduce today.

As I have stated, the Committee on Higher Education in Minnesota reported that "the financial rewards of teaching must be brought into line with those of other professions." Not long ago I was in a certain community. I shall not mention its name, because I do not wish to bring it into disrepute. However, in that community the man who delivered beer to the door of the tavern received more income than the principal of any elementary or secondary school in the State. This seems to me to be a lack of a sense of values. I believe that if we want an adequate number of trained principals of high schools and of elementary schools, or superintendents of high schools and of elementary schools, we had better maintain economic, social, and other kinds of rewards and incentives which are good enough and big enough not only to keep such people on the job but also to bring other people into those fields.

Mr. President, it is becoming very difficult indeed to keep good teachers on

the job. In the metropolitan area of Washington, in the county in Maryland in which I live, teachers are compelled to work at night as accountants, clerks, and taxicab drivers in order to obtain adequate income with which to sustain themselves and their families under the present high cost of living.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am very happy to yield to my friend from South Carolina.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I should like to ask the Senator from Minnesota whether it is not true that he is speaking of Montgomery County in Maryland.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; and that county has a very good public school system.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The Senator apparently is speaking of a county which has 1 of the 10 best school systems in the United States. Is that not correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is absolutely correct. It has one of the finest school systems in the country.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The Senator is not referring to some school system that is far down the line from the standpoint of high educational standards. Is that correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I was not talking about an area of our country which is obviously hard pressed. In Montgomery County there are many people who are in the so-called middle-income group. Their resources are greater. They have a school system which is considered one of the best in the country.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. It is considered to be 1 of the 10 best in the United States.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct. But even there the rewards are anything but enticing.

Mr. President, I have great admiration for these self-sacrificing teachers. I want every Senator to know that. I have never in my life seen a group of people who are more willing to give so much and receive so little in terms of appreciation or monetary rewards as the American schoolteachers.

They need a few champions; and although I am not appointing myself as their champion, I shall certainly espouse their cause, if for no other reason than that of self-protection. I have at heart the interests of the families of America because I have a personal interest in my own family. I am concerned with this problem because I know the truth about the problems caused by the growing school population of this country.

Mr. President, if we know nothing else in the Senate we should know how to count. If we can count and if we can add, we know that more schoolteachers and better school facilities are needed.

I am not at all impressed when I read in the newspapers that a new office building is being built downtown. I am impressed, however, when I read about the construction of a new school building, complete with cafeterias which are adequate to give service to the number of schoolchildren who will go to that school, so that the children will not have

to eat during the noon hour at the desks at which they sit all during the school hours, in overcrowded classrooms, with harassed teachers. If this country should reach the point where it cannot longer afford to provide adequate places where our children can eat, we had better think again about some of our other expenditures.

Mr. President, steeply rising enrollments and the certain prospects of their continuation at the secondary level are two of the central facts about American schooling that confront us today.

Serious as it is, Mr. President, even the teacher shortage, mentioned in the Minnesota report, is not the end of the matter. At the primary and secondary level, schools must be constructed. We know that somehow assistance must be brought to increase higher educational facilities also if the new burdens of increased enrollment are to be met. This is a problem affecting public and private institutions as well, but particularly the latter which have been increasingly deprived of sources of support which they enjoyed a generation ago. We all know that endowed colleges and universities have been unable to increase their endowment income proportionately to their increased demands and increased expense. Sharp increases in income and estate taxes have reduced the capital accumulations from which endowments formerly came.

Somehow, somewhere, facilities assistance must be provided to help meet this need.

Last October Adlai Stevenson released a comprehensive paper entitled "A Program for Education," which summarized the five great problem areas in education in America today. He analyzed clearly the shortage facing us: the shortage of buildings, the shortage of teachers, the shortage of talent, the shortage of facts, and the shortage of policy.

Far from being merely a campaign document, Governor Stevenson's statement is as valuable now as it was when he made it.

While I do not purport to cover all of the points he stressed in that program, I sympathize with them, still find them instructive and worth restudying, and consequently ask unanimous consent that the text of Governor Stevenson's statement be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NEW AMERICA  
(By Adlai E. Stevenson)  
A PROGRAM FOR EDUCATION

The dream of a new America begins in a classroom.

This is as true today as in the days of the little red schoolhouse. The giant steps our Nation has taken toward the goal of universal educational opportunity has, more than anything else, given us the technical and economic progress we enjoy today. Public education in America has been the great lever by which we have lifted a whole society by lifting each person toward his own full potential.

These educational achievements of the past have put us now on the threshold of a new America. But whether we can cross this

threshold and seize the brilliant opportunities that lie beyond depends heavily upon what we now do to advance American education ever further. The passport to a better society is better education, for one and all.

Better education for all American youth is thus an imperative for a new America, but it is also an extremely difficult assignment. Our schools and colleges are today up against severe obstacles and handicaps. We must work hard just to keep from losing ground in education; we must work doubly hard to gain new ground.

We must identify our most critical problems in education and come directly to grips with them. If we make one set of decisions, we can look with confidence to a future in which our children and grandchildren will have a chance to realize their talents and fulfill their promise.

If we make another set of decisions—or if we make no decisions at all and let drift take over the superintendency of our schools—then we can anticipate only the growing misuse and waste of our human resources, only the frustration of the American promise.

Unless we are prepared to do something about the crisis of our schools, there is simply no use even of talking about a new America.

*Crisis and success*

When the Founding Fathers wrote the Constitution, education was an aristocratic privilege. But the logic of American history has meant a steady widening of educational opportunity. "If a people expects to be both ignorant and free," said Jefferson, "it expects what never was and never will be." Today there are 33 million young people from every walk and station of life in our schools. Truly now education belongs to all of us.

This triumph of the educational idea in America, coupled with the sharp rise in births during and since World War II, has filled our schools so full that they are today bursting at the seams.

And the great rush has only begun. Five years from now our already overcrowded elementary schools will have to serve 3 extra children for every 10 now in school. By 1970 our high schools will have 7 extra students for every 10 now in school. College and university enrollments will double during the next 10 to 15 years.

These are not speculations; these figures come from counting the noses of children already born.

*Crisis and quality*

The crisis in education is not just a problem of overcrowding. The kind of world we live in has compounded the crisis.

At home we are entering a period of rapid technological and social change—a period which will test our ideas, our knowledge, and our creativity. And abroad we confront a world in ferment, where the aspirations of long-submerged peoples, as well as the dogmatic fanaticism of the Communists, have created tensions that the rising generation must know and master. "Human history," H. G. Wells wrote, "becomes more and more a race between education and catastrophe." The faster trouble runs in the world the better the job our schools must do, if we are just to keep ahead of disaster.

But keeping ahead of disaster is not enough. The problem is more than one of giving desks and primers to the boys and girls flooding into our schools. We look to education not just to keep us out of trouble; we look to education to keep advancing us toward a fuller and more fruitful life.

*Summary*

This is our educational crisis in broad outline. It would be irresponsible to promise quick and rapid solutions. We cannot produce overnight an abundance of modern, well-lighted school buildings with plenty of capable and devoted teachers, where every child is free to realize his best self. The

short-run task of rehabilitating our schools is one for a generation. The whole task of education will never be finished.

But what I do consider possible—what I believe to be long overdue and now imperative—is that we stake out the generation-long task and start doing something about it at once.

I want to emphasize at the outset that education is primarily the responsibility of the community, of the local and State government. And full credit must be given for the encouraging developments in our communities. Most local governments have been enlarging their support of education; citizens' groups are working valiantly to improve our schools; private foundations are providing aid and leadership in the fight for improved teacher training and for better salaries.

When the local community can improve conditions no further, however, and there is still much to be done, we are right to look to the Federal Government for assistance.

But in the end, success or failure in meeting the educational challenge will rest largely in the community. It must make the maximum financial contribution within the limits of its resources. It must provide efficient and economic operation of the schools. All the Federal Government can do is to make it possible for the community to discharge its responsibilities.

But to do this, the Federal Government must take a number of steps as swiftly as possible.

Proposal No. 1: The establishment of a national policy of Federal aid to education where local and individual resources cannot meet the need.

Proposal No. 2: Assumption immediately by the Federal Government, of a share in meeting the present urgent financial requirements of our educational system, particularly those for more classrooms and for more, qualified teachers.

Proposal No. 3: A program designed to help insure against able students being denied a chance to have a college education because they can't afford it, and to encourage such students to enter teaching or other lines of work where there are serious personnel shortages.

Proposal No. 4: Expansion of the exchange programs which in the last 7 years have sent thousands of American students and teachers overseas and have brought foreign scholars to this country.

Proposal No. 5: Development of new approaches to the challenging opportunities in vocational and adult education.

SPECIFIC PROBLEMS

There are six great problem areas in American education today.

1. The shortage of buildings:

Many of you know from your experience with your own children the shortage of school buildings which has led to such grave overcrowding of existing facilities—to classes too large for effective teaching, to children attending schools in shifts, even to the use of unsafe buildings.

A careful congressional study showed that in 1952 we needed new classrooms equivalent in size to a 1-story building, 50 feet wide, stretching from New York to San Francisco. And the deficit now is vastly greater.

We should be building 100,000 new classrooms each year.

Actually we have been building only about half that many.

In other words, we are losing ground at the rate of nearly 50,000 classrooms a year. And we are losing ground precisely where we can least afford it—in the poorer districts of the country.

2. The shortage of teachers:

Today's ominous shortage of qualified teachers had its beginnings in a great national mistake—our failure to give teaching as a profession sufficient reward and



honor. Now as the wave of children born during the war begin to grow up, we are paying the price for neglect of our teachers. We do not have enough good teachers—we do not have enough teachers at all. This teachers' shortage may reach proportions of disaster for our culture and our economy.

Today young men and women—many who would like to serve their fellowmen as teachers—are taking jobs in industry and in other professions. Why? Because they earn more in the vital 5 to 10 years when they are hoping to get married and to establish families of their own; because there is a ceiling, and a rather low one, on what they would earn, both in money and prestige, even after many years as teachers; and because their initiative might not be fully challenged in education, where responsibility does not increase with experience and ability and promotion often results less from superior performance than from length of service and the earning of various credits.

Unless we do something to improve the status of our teachers, fewer and fewer of our able and ambitious young people will go into the teaching profession. This can result only in a gradual downward drift of the level of teaching and hence of our whole level of education. It is not just that we need more teachers. It is that we need more good teachers—that we need, indeed, the best teachers in the world. Our children deserve nothing less.

How well equipped are we to meet the needs of the next few years?

We know that enrollments will increase at a predictable rate.

Although I find a baffling confusion in the statistics in this field, it is clear that we are falling tens of thousands of teachers short every year. The most reliable figures indicate that right now we are short about 75,000 to 90,000 teachers in the total teaching force.

We know, too, that we will need about 50,000 more school teachers every year to take care of the new children coming to school. And we know that we need perhaps twice that many new teachers every year to replace experienced teachers who drop out of schools—to get married, to raise children, to go to higher-paid jobs in business, or to retire.

When the schools opened this September, they had to hire some 90,000 (another source reports 78 to 80 thousand) emergency teachers—that is, inadequately trained teachers. The rest of the slack was taken up by crowding more children into already overcrowded classrooms.

And this year our colleges turned out only 2,600 qualified new mathematics teachers and 228 new physics teachers. At that rate of supply, how can we expect our 80,000 high schools to turn out children equipped to live in the world of modern science?

In the colleges and universities, the situation is even more serious. In the next 10 or 15 years, enrollment will probably rise by 100 percent. For every teacher now employed, two new ones will have to be found in the next 15 years.

It will not be easy to meet this shortage. It has developed because we have failed to give teaching the dignity and status this vital function deserves. To be blunt about it, we have not paid teachers enough.

We have all heard it said, perhaps said it ourselves, that money isn't everything to a teacher; that teaching is a life of service. But who can doubt that a truly professional standing based on a truly professional salary would make all the difference in the world in attracting fully qualified people into teaching.

"The teachers of this country," said William James, "have its future in their hands." The national neglect of the teaching profession may do incalculable harm to us all.

### 3. The shortage of talent:

We can already see the consequences of our educational shortages. Recent studies by the

Commission on Human Resources and Advanced Training have demonstrated that our schools and colleges are not meeting the growing demands of our country for specialists, men and women trained to do the important jobs of our society. Business and Government, society as a whole, needs more scientists, engineers, doctors, social scientists, technical experts, psychologists; above all, we need more good school and college teachers.

It is too bad that it takes a divided world to bring these shortages home. In the first 5 years after 1950, the number of young people who earned engineering degrees in this country dropped from 52,000 to 23,000, while in the same period in the Soviet Union the number of graduates from technical schools offering courses equivalent to those of our engineering schools grew from 28,000 to 63,000. Russia's gain practically equaled our drop, and Russia is now producing 2 engineers for each 1 we turn out.

I do not suggest that we should set our sights or determine our needs by comparison with the Soviet Union. But I do suggest that the growth of Communist power may be explained as much by Communist investments in education as by any other one thing. And I think we might well ask ourselves whether a free people by free decision will also be prepared to make this best of all investments—investment in the education of its youth. The answer must be "Yes."

The shortage of trained technicians is by no means our only, or perhaps even our greatest, want. In a free society, where the will of the citizen is determining, we need, above all, citizens with a good liberal arts education. We need businessmen and working men and women who know our history and our literature and the values of our civilization; we need specialists and experts, to be sure, but specialists who know far more than their specialties, who are, first of all, educated people. We need poets as well as public rewards—yes, and we need politicians. A group of scientists at the California Institute of Technology recently concluded that the most critical bottleneck to future national growth would be, not natural resources, but "brain power."

And I want to say that I see these shortages as causes for concern, but surely not for dismay. They reflect the fact that our dynamic society has an insatiable appetite for capable, well-educated people. As we feed that appetite, we move toward the new America.

4. The shortage of facts: What the Office of Education can tell us about our schools and colleges is shockingly little compared to the facts that other Federal agencies can give us about agriculture, banking, and industry. Your Congressman can send you more information about hoof and mouth disease than he can about the challenges confronting our educational system and the terrible wastage of human resources that an inadequate educational system inflicts. We simply do not have clear, accurate, and up-to-date facts to answer some basic questions about our schools. This is highly unsatisfactory.

5. The shortage of policy: The fact is that the Eisenhower administration has utterly failed to develop a comprehensive national policy for education. It has not set up the administrative machinery to produce such a policy. It has not probed or put into perspective the facts of the educational crisis. It has failed to offer strong leadership in the cause of our most valuable resource—our children.

In 1955, President Eisenhower convened a White House Conference on Education. For nearly 2 years, the prospect of this Conference has been used as an excuse for inaction.

The Conference had been billed as an effort to define the relationship of the Federal Government to education, but it did not do so. Its report supported limited Federal grants for school construction but left open

other questions. In short, our schools were asked to wait through 3 years of gathering crisis for a definition of the Federal role, only to emerge with no definition.

Not until after the Conference did the Eisenhower administration act. The action then was to put forth a weak bill for Federal aid limited to school construction alone.

When the House of Representatives took up the 1956 school aid bill, the President sat by while 96 Republican Congressmen first supported an antisegregation rider to the bill and then voted against the bill itself. Indeed, in the midst of the debate, a Republican Congressman read a letter from Mr. Eisenhower in which he wrote: "In short, unless we are careful, even the great and necessary educational processes in our country will become yet another vehicle by which the believers in paternalism, if not outright socialism, will gain still additional power for the Central Government." A majority of Democrats supported the school bill; a majority of Republicans opposed it. It was defeated.

The record of the Eisenhower administration is a record, so far as education is concerned, of words and of conferences—but of little action, and no results.

The failure in conception, the failure in action, is a symptom of a deeper failure. It is a symptom of incapacity or unwillingness to see the problem of education in human terms—in terms of boys and girls with abilities and aspirations, children who may either be held down and defeated by a poor educational system or be given new possibilities and new goals by a good one. Who can watch a child go off on his first day at school without wishing him everything he needs to equip him best for life and assure the most complete personal fulfillment?

I cannot believe that the American people hold anything superior to the future of their children. I know that the Nation which can afford the best automobiles, the brightest television sets, and the biggest aircraft carriers in the world can also afford the best schools. The need is for leadership—leadership which is interested, determined, and imaginative; leadership which cares about our children; leadership which cares about the kind of world they will build; leadership which understands that, in the end, all human achievement begins and ends with people.

### A NEW ROLE FOR THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IN EDUCATION

Together these shortages have produced the educational crisis. The problem now is how to meet the crisis—and how to meet it in a way consistent with our traditions and our ideals.

It is essential that we be absolutely clear in our minds about two things; how we decide what our children shall learn, and how we pay for their learning.

From the start, we have thought it best to let the citizens of local communities decide what kind of education they wanted for their own children. In time, the State governments began to work with the local authorities, insisting that the communities meet certain standards and encouraging local initiative to improve the schools. But operation and policy have remained essentially in local hands—and this is the way it should be. A healthy educational system can grow only from local roots.

### The Federal Government and education

But let us also be clear about one other thing: This tradition has not prevented the Federal Government from taking an interest in education and from supporting our educational system in a variety of ways—ever since the Army, under General Washington, began to provide general instruction in 1779. In 1862, when President Lincoln signed the bill establishing the land-grant colleges, the Federal Government laid down the basis for our State colleges and

universities. In 1867, Congress set up the Bureau now known as the Office of Education. Beginning in 1937, Federal funds were made available for vocational education in local school districts. In the past 20 years, largely under Democratic leadership, the Federal Government has provided monies to initiate and support a considerable number of school activities—the school-lunch program for pupils and the GI education program being perhaps the best known.

In short, the Federal Government has for a long time been giving money for education purposes without dictating what the schools should teach.

#### *A new situation*

Two great social changes make it imperative that we look now to the Federal Government for a much larger part of the support of our schools.

One change is the fantastic expansion of our school population. This has led to an enormous increase in the school bill.

We are now spending more than three times what we spent in 1938 and more than 36 times what we spent in 1900.

Annual public-school expenditures by State and local governments stand at near the \$10 billion mark in 1956. Estimates indicate that during the decade ahead the education bill will rise to \$15 billion just to meet our minimum needs, and to perhaps as much as \$20 billion if educational standards are raised to what it is generally agreed they ought to be. And this does not take into account the cost of private education.

The second great change is that for various reasons the local communities have been less and less able to foot this bill.

In the past, local communities have relied mainly on property taxes to pay for schools—taxes on land and personal possessions.

In recent years the local communities have been having a very hard time realizing enough money for schools from property taxes.

There are several reasons for this. For one thing, assessments have rarely reflected the true value of the property. More importantly, property values have not gone up proportionately with the rise in national income and production, so that property taxes have not yielded nearly so much, for instance, as income taxes. In relation to the national product, the general property tax yields only one-quarter as much as it did 25 years ago.

It will thus be necessary in the years ahead to depend more and more on the taxing power of the State and Federal Governments for the money for our schools.

Some State governments are in a position to contribute more than they have in recent years. Some are not. In any case, State revenues are reaching their limits, especially when they are not directly affected by an enlargement of income. So it has become increasingly up to the Federal Government to provide the money to set our school system on a solid basis.

We should face this problem squarely and promptly.

As I have said, the best information available indicates that it will cost us, as a nation, from \$500 million to \$1 billion more each year for the next 10 years to build the schools and hire the teachers our rapidly growing school-age population needs.

We have three choices:

1. We can do without the new schools and new teachers we need, or

2. We can leave it to the States to do the best they can to match the means to the needs, or

3. We can raise part (at least of the added requirements) through Federal taxes, primarily the income tax.

These choices are not going to be easy ones. To me, the first one is out of the question. The second one, for the reasons discussed

above, appears in most cases to be almost impossible; there just isn't this much more give in the local property tax and the State revenue sources.

The prospect of increased Federal expenditures, for anything, is one that any holder of national office or any candidate for such office must face with stern anxiety.

But I say this: Any opposition to increased Federal expenditure for education is honest, under today's circumstances, only if it includes a clean-cut decision that we do not need more schools and more teachers than local sources are providing. I don't believe any responsible person thinks this is true.

I hope, as part of this series of papers, to make bluntly clear the economic and fiscal consequences of any enlarged Federal welfare programs. I am setting forth here only what I think are the goals America has in mind. We always want and need more than we can have at any given time. And we shall have to decide which of these things we feel we can afford and which ones we can't.

#### PROPOSALS FOR EDUCATION IN THE NEW AMERICA

Proposal No. 1, a policy:

A Democratic administration will set the highest priority on the establishment of a clear-cut national policy for the improvement of educational facilities.

The goal of our national policy should be to permit the fullest possible development of each individual's capacities and talents through strong and equal educational opportunities. It should aim, not just at getting more children into more classrooms for more years, but at making each child's education a richer and more challenging experience than ever before.

A necessary step toward the development of such a policy is to remove the United States Office of Education from its present hiding place and to give it higher status.

At the present time the Office of Education is a stepchild of our Government. A survey not long ago revealed that less than 1 percent of the Federal funds actually spent on education was channeled through the Office of Education. The chief of this office has less importance than second- and third-rank officers in other departments.

It has been frequently proposed that there should be a separate Department of Education in the President's Cabinet. I think this should be given consideration, but I think we should be sure that it would not aggravate the administrative problem in our Federal Government. And I think we would also want to be careful that such action would not introduce a political element which would be undesirable and shift the center of gravity in this field from the local to the National Government level. In any event, however, a fundamental reorganization of the Federal Government's administrative machinery for the handling of the problems of education seems imperative.

Proposal No. 2, Federal aid to the States:

There is substantial agreement today that some form of Federal financial assistance to the States for educational purposes is required. The real issue now is not where there should be Federal assistance, but rather what form it should take and how much it should be.

This program should include aid for school construction. The Kelley bill, which was before the House of Representatives this year, represented a substantial step toward this end.

But I do not think that the Federal-aid program can advantageously be limited to grants for school construction. The building shortage is the most obvious one, but the hidden crisis—the shortage of teachers—is surely as important.

The priority needs differ from community to community and from State to State, and the Federal Government is not in the best position to judge these individual needs.

Some communities desperately need new classrooms, but others are more immediately in need of more and better teachers, more books, or a richer curriculum. It seems to me we should consider a program of general aid, leaving the States and communities free to assign their own priorities in using supplemental funds from the Federal Government.

There will be the question of whether the Federal grants should be made outright or on a matching basis. There are advantages and disadvantages to both forms. The matching grants offer certain safeguards. Yet they may also mean a disruption of broader State and local fiscal programs. Although such a decision would have to be worked out on the basis of full explanation and discussion, and ultimately by Congress, my own present thinking is that at least a part of the Federal-aid program should be on a nonmatching basis.

There would, of course, have to be means of positive insurance that Federal funds would not be used to reduce or supplant State or local support for education.

I would think that Federal grants would take into account both the number of school-age children and the element of economic need in the various States.

Many States already follow an equalization principle in distributing State aid among their communities; a Federal program embodying the same principles would give further encouragement in this practice. The Federal and State Governments alike should be concerned with reducing the severe educational handicaps presently suffered by youngsters who, through no fault of their own, happen to live in economically underprivileged communities.

I would feel that Congress should adopt legislation that leaves little room for administrative discretion in the fixing of the amount or terms of the Federal grants; thus any attempt to inject Federal control would have to be thrashed out in the open on the floor of Congress and could not be tucked away in the fine print of some administrative regulation.

It must be recognized that this program will be costly.

President Eisenhower proposed a school-construction program of \$250 million a year, totaling \$1.25 billion over 5 years. The Democratic-sponsored Kelley bill would have authorized \$400 million of construction grants annually, for a total of \$1.6 billion over 4 years.

We must expect that as the school population keeps on rising and as we turn to meeting not only the school construction need but also the teacher shortage, these figures will have to be raised. I have already referred to the estimates which have been made indicating the inevitable increase during the next 10 years in the total amount of educational costs in this country. We must decide how much of this should be borne by the State and local governments (as 96 percent of it is now), and how much we should shift to the Federal Government.

It is impossible to fix a price tag on a Federal-aid program without having first made a determination as to how much of this added burden the States and local communities can and will bear, whether Federal participation should go beyond school construction costs (as I think it should), whether the Federal grants should be on an outright grant or a matching-grant basis, and so forth.

But I do want to suggest that just as a business matter every dollar we spend on educating American boys and girls will be returned—with interest—in terms of their increased productivity; and further, that if we decide to skimp on education, every dollar we save will probably be lost twice over in terms of things like the costs of juvenile delinquency, boys unable to meet the standards for military service, the unavailability



of scientists and engineers, and increased relief rolls.

Proposal No. 3, grants for higher education:

It is estimated that each year at least 100,000 of our ablest high school students stop their formal education for primarily economic reasons. The record is also clear that there is today a serious shortage of young men and women adequately trained in certain fields, such as teaching, science, and engineering.

I think we should seriously consider, and probably explore at least on an experimental basis, some of the proposals that have been made to meet these problems.

One of these proposals which seems to me to commend itself is for the establishment of a limited number of federally supported undergraduate scholarships or loans to students who want to go to college, are qualified to make good use of a college education, and will otherwise be denied this opportunity.

I think we should also consider the granting of fellowships, on a basis of merit and need, to specially qualified students who are prepared to commit themselves to service in teaching or in other fields of particularly acute shortage.

I realize that these proposals present many problems and implications which must be carefully and fully explored.

One of these is the desirability of so administering this program as not to affect the balance between public and private institutions. It has been urged, in this connection, that any program of scholarship or fellowship grants which may work more to the benefit of private than of public colleges and universities should be balanced by grants to States for aid to higher education in public institutions. The point is an important one and, whether in the suggested form or some other, should be taken into account.

If a loan, rather than a scholarship and fellowship, program appears advisable then I should think that arrangements would be worked out for making these loans through local banks, with appropriate government protection.

The problems of determining need and qualification would have to be met.

Any scholarship program of this kind would have to be carefully drawn and restricted to prevent abuses by the unworthy and also to prevent any displacement of the private philanthropy which has been and will continue to be indispensable to the development of our colleges and universities.

To avoid the political and administrative complications that such a program might entail, it might be well to place its administration in the hands of an impartial, competent organization outside the Federal Government, just as has been done with the eminently successful Fulbright program of awards to scholars for study abroad.

Both to avoid excessive costs and to permit adequate tryout of the operation of such a system I would recommend, as I have indicated, that it be undertaken originally on an experimental basis. But I cannot urge too strongly that something of this perhaps bold character will be required if we are going to meet the problem of high costs of higher education on the one hand and serious shortages of adequately trained young men and women on the other.

Proposal No. 4, expansion of exchange programs: I think we should continue and expand the exchange programs under which, in the last 7 years, over 42,000 grants have been made to enable Americans to study abroad and foreign students and scholars to visit the United States. At a time when this country has had to assume leadership of the free world, these programs have been of great value in giving our citizens fresh understanding of conditions abroad. They have also helped dispel myths and misunderstandings about this country overseas.

Proposal No. 5, expansion of vocational and adult education:

The Federal program of assistance for vocational education should be expanded. The present administration has sought on 2 occasions to cut the program, by 25 percent 1 year and by an additional 6 percent the next. Yet vocational education is given to only about one-half the students below the college level who need and want it; more than 5,000 high schools serving farm children lack programs of vocational agriculture.

The rapid pace of change in the world and the prospect of increased technical development and a shorter workweek, is driving home to us the important fact that a person's education should not and must not end with a school diploma or a college degree; it only begins there.

Opportunities for continuing education, all through life, must be an important ingredient of the new America. Already there are some 50 million Americans engaged in one form or another of adult education—more than the total enrollment of our elementary and secondary schools. The need and the demand will mount rapidly. What should we be doing to meet this important need? Obviously there are no easy answers. We must seek them out, try them out, apply them on an adequate scale.

A strong system of adult education will do many things for us as a nation. Not least of all it can liberate us from old passions and prejudices, it can help us as citizens find wiser answers to new and pressing public problems, and it can make us impervious to artificial answers in the form of hucksters' slogans.

This is another major educational challenge to which we must turn our attention, another national challenge calling for leadership at the highest level.

"In proportion as a Government gives forth to public opinion," said George Washington, "it is essential that public opinion shall be enlightened." Education is one of the pillars on which our freedom rests. When we neglect education, we weaken the whole foundation of free society. And when we neglect education in an age of global conflict, we risk the very safety of our Nation and the future of freedom in the world.

But, more than this, education is one means by which the individual can realize his own highest capacity.

It is essential, therefore, that education be available equally to all, without distinction or discrimination based on race or creed or color or economic condition.

The crisis in our schools is not only a challenge to democracy and to national security. Above all, it is a challenge to conscience—to our moral conviction of the worth of individual human beings, to our love and hopes for our children, and to our faith in America.

Thus far we have responded to the challenge by pious words, by conferences, by token gestures, by promise and postponement.

The time has now come to respond by deeds, courageous, decisive and strong, in the tradition of our Nation and in the spirit of our democracy.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, a comprehensive attempt to meet these basic educational problems is made in 3 of the 6 bills which I send to the desk today. These three are the School Construction Act of 1957, the Student Aid Act of 1957, and the Educational Tax Credit Act of 1957. Let me summarize these bills briefly.

#### SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION

First of all, Mr. President, let me say that I am sure other proposals along these lines will be made, as others have already been made, by my colleagues in

the Senate. I know that my good friend, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA] introduced on the very first day of this session a school construction bill, which calls for Federal assistance for school construction. I know that the distinguished and able chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] has introduced in the past, and will introduce again, bills for Federal aid for school construction.

I see on the floor the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER]. I well remember in the 83d Congress the determined fight made by the Senator from Kentucky for Federal aid for school construction. It gladdens my heart to know that he is with us, ready to fight for that kind of program again this year. It is a program in which he believes.

The first of my bills, Mr. President, is entitled the "School Construction Act of 1957" and is similar to S. 480 which I introduced in the 84th Congress.

This bill results from extensive hearings in both the Senate and the House during the past several years. It would authorize Federal financial assistance to build schools, but it would leave responsibility for administering the actual construction with the State and local school authorities who are acquainted with local needs. Its requirement for State plans to be approved by the United States Commissioner of Education will insure that the Federal funds will go where they are most needed in each State.

It was my privilege as a Senator to hold the first hearings ever held in the United States Congress on the subject of Federal aid for school construction. I held those hearings in the spring of 1949, as a very junior Senator and as a member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. The first act authorizing Federal assistance for school construction was the result of those hearings. That act was passed in the 81st Congress, and provided for Federal assistance for communities which were under what we called Federal impact. It was designed to assist communities with Federal installations which increased the school populations in those areas.

Under that Federal School Construction Assistance Act literally hundreds of millions of dollars have gone into communities in which there are located Federal military reservations, defense plants, and large numbers of Federal employees. In fact, the metropolitan area of Washington, including the suburbs of Maryland and Virginia, benefit from that school-construction program.

In that connection, I should like to pay tribute to the late Senator from Ohio, Mr. Taft, who joined me, as a member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, in pressing for the passage of that legislation. I remember very well when we were able to get a \$5 million appropriation with which to make a nationwide study of school needs. That nationwide study was completed by the end of the 82d Congress. The study was put on the desk of the President of the United States and of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. That study was complete with respect

to every State and Territory of the United States. It was accomplished through the splendid cooperation of the local school districts and State school officers and authorities. That study is available to any citizen who wishes to read it. All he need do to get a copy is to communicate with his Representative or Senator, or ask for a copy of it at the office of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Mr. President, that study is as accurate today as it was 2 or 3 years ago, except that the problem is more pressing and the need for effective action is far more urgent.

I will continue to do some harassing along this line until worthwhile action is taken. Apparently the way to get something done in Washington is to bother the living daylights out of all concerned until they finally give up and do something about it. So, Mr. President, I will start the bothering process right now.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am always glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is referring only to this one issue, as I understand?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct. I thank the Senator from Oregon for his comment, because there are other bills that we also need to pass. I know I will have the cooperation of my friend from Oregon in bringing this issue to the attention of our colleagues and the country.

Mr. President, the bill will do what the Federal Government should do to help solve one of our most pressing national domestic problems.

The amount of Federal funds to be expended is left unspecified in the bill; this amount would be as determined by Congress. The funds would be distributed to the States according to the number of persons 5 to 17 years of age in each State. The States and local school districts would be required to match the Federal funds dollar for dollar.

In order to make certain that the Federal funds will not be substituted for State and local funds which would otherwise be spent for school construction, each State educational agency would be required to submit a State plan of operation. This State plan would describe the program developed in each State, provide for full fiscal accountability by the State agency to the Federal Government for all Federal funds, provide for the establishment of standards for locating, planning, and constructing school facilities, and provide for reports to the Commissioner of Education concerning how the Federal funds have been expended.

The most important aspect of the State plan required by the bill, however, would be that each State would be required to set forth principles for determining the relative priority of school facility construction projects, taking into account the relative financial resources of local school districts, the relative local efforts which have been and are being made to meet school needs out of State and local funds, and the

relative urgency of local needs for the school facilities according to the extent of overcrowding, the extent of lack of facilities, and the extent to which unsafe and obsolete facilities are currently in use.

Following the approval of each State plan by the United States Commissioner of Education, the administration and allocation among local school districts would be conducted by the State agency for education.

Under the provisions of the bill, it would be impossible for any Federal agency to control in any way the programs of instruction in schools. The Federal Government would be a financial partner with the States and local school districts in constructing schools where they are most needed in each State, but the actual planning and construction of the schools would be left to the State education agencies and to the local school districts within each State.

Mr. President, particularly after the unfortunate record of inaction on school construction in the 84th Congress, the need for early action is obvious. It is long overdue. Members of the Senate may recall that during the 81st Congress I was chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on School Construction. Our hearings even then—8 years ago—demonstrated an urgent demand for action by the Congress to help to alleviate the pressing school construction problem. The hearings before our committee even then disclosed that untold numbers of children were attending school in unsafe buildings, many of them fire traps, and were going to school in shifts like factory workers—indeed, a sorry reflection on the values of our society. These findings have now been confirmed many times, the problems have multiplied, and the situation is becoming progressively worse.

Information collected last year by the White House Conference on Education indicated that there is a shortage of at least 200,000 classrooms, about 150,000 of which represent the backlog needs and 50,000 represent the rooms required annually to handle increased enrollment.

President Eisenhower in his latest state of the Union message asked Congress to give high priority to a school construction bill. I may be pardoned if I suggest that I hope that the President himself will also give high priority to leadership on this issue among the recalcitrants and waverers in his own party, or in my own party, without whose active help we shall have another year of un-built schools. I commend his bill to the attention of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee, and hope that hearings may speedily begin on this and similar measures so that we in the Congress can fulfill our responsibilities on this matter without further delay.

I am not concerned about whose bill is reported. I am not concerned about who is the author of the bill. What I am concerned about is having a bill reported which will meet the school construction needs of our country.

#### FEDERAL SCHOLARSHIPS

Mr. President, now let me say a word about Federal scholarships. My second

bill, the Student Aid Act of 1957, would, among other things, establish a Federal scholarship program and would provide annual appropriations for it.

The appropriations would begin in fiscal 1958, with \$40 million. They are to increase by \$40 million each year. The authorization is for \$160 million in 1961. At this figure, the appropriations would remain static.

I do not want to hear anyone say that that is going to be a lot of money. I have been hearing testimony within the past few days to the effect that we may send more money than that to countries which have oil royalties running as high as \$200 million or \$300 million. So \$160 million for Federal scholarships for the young people of America is indeed a modest sum.

The scholarships are to be awarded to high school students everywhere in the United States for higher education, free, of course, from discrimination for reasons of sex, creed, or race. Each State is to have its quota of scholarships based on a formula providing that one-half of the total number of scholarships shall be allotted among the States in percentages equal to the percentage the State's high-school graduates bear to the national total of high-school graduates for the year. The remaining one-half are to be allotted in the proportion that the State's population between 19 and 21 bears to the national total population of that age.

Any high-school graduate would be eligible to apply for a scholarship. From among those applying, those showing greatest promise would be granted certificates of scholarship. Stipends would be granted to the neediest among these scholars, the amount of the stipend varying with the demonstrated need of the recipient, but not exceeding \$1,000 per academic year, for a maximum of 4 years. The recipient could attend any bona fide college or university of his choice which would admit him; and so long as he continued in good standing at the educational institution, his stipend would be paid directly to him in installments suited to the demands of the academic year.

During a time of active hostilities, or when found by the President to be necessary in the interest of national defense, at least 60 percent of the stipends must go to students engaging in studies which are determined in a manner prescribed by the President to be related to the national defense or defense-supporting activities.

The only further qualifications for scholarships are that the recipient must first, have a certificate of graduation from a high school of that State or, if graduated from an out-of-State high school have followed the course of studies recognized as adequate by his own State; second, he must not be eligible for veterans' educational training; third, the recipient must apply for the scholarship in accordance with State rules; and fourth, he must not have had any Federal scholarship under this or any other act vacated except for good cause.

The bill contemplates that when the program is in full operation approximately 50,000 to 60,000 men and women



will enter college or university each year with the aid of Federal stipends of varying amounts.

The scholarship commissions in each State would receive applications from students, conduct the objective examinations to select the abler among the applicants, assess the financial need of those qualifying as scholars, and allot the amount of the stipend in each case.

Provision is also made for consultation between the Office of Education and the various Federal agencies, such as the Atomic Energy Commission, the National Science Foundation, and the Department of Defense, which operate special programs of aid to undergraduate and graduate students so as to assure full coordination of their Federal scholarship program with other federally supported programs.

While the bill, if enacted, is to be administered by the Commissioner of Education, and while he will be assisted by the National Council on Student Aid of 12 members to represent organizational and professional interests, nevertheless the bill makes it very clear that there will be no Federal direction, supervision, or control over the curriculum or program of instruction of any educational institution.

The student scholarship recipient makes his own choice of the institution of higher learning which he wishes to attend.

#### FACILITIES ASSISTANCE

Clearly, Mr. President, institutions already burdened with swollen enrollments ought not to be expected to handle additionally expanded student bodies, as a result of the new scholarship program, without some consideration being given to easing the pressure on existing facilities by assisting in their expansion. Legislation ought not to ease the financial burden currently barring talented youth from college attendance while ignoring the disproportionately increased load placed on the educational institutions by the increased attendance. We do not solve our total problems by solving a difficulty at one end of the spectrum which will create a new one at the other.

Hence, Mr. President, I have tried in this bill, the Student Aid Act of 1957, to suggest a means of compensating the institution itself for its estimated costs of providing education to the new scholarship holder over and above the amounts it receives from the student for providing the education. Under title IV of this bill, the Commissioner of Education is instructed to work out a formula with each institution on a cost-of-services-rendered basis, including an amount for instruction, plant operation, administration, library costs, and any other costs reasonably allocable to providing educational services. The student himself would technically be the carrier of this grant, not to exceed \$500 per year per scholarship student. The grant would follow from his choice of institution and would be payable to that institution on a basis worked out separately between the Commissioner and the institution.

The cost-formula technique admittedly leaves some discretion in the hands of

the Commissioner who, incidentally, will also be advised by the National Council established in the bill. The formula feature has nevertheless seemed advisable, because it has appeared to be desirable to go beyond any simple "cost of instruction," "teaching salary," "flat grant," or "customary fees and charges" basis for reimbursement for institutional costs. Past experience, under the GI bill particularly, has proved these factors to be highly ambiguous, unstable, and unsatisfactory. I frankly offer this proposal on facilities assistance, aware of the difficulties involved, in the hope that the proposal may be further refined and improved. Of its fundamental equity and necessity, I have no doubt at all.

#### STUDENT LOANS AND TEACHER'S WRITEOFF

Mr. President, another feature of the bill, the Student Aid Act of 1957, establishes a long-term, low-interest loan program for college students, authorizing insurance of up to \$25 million in loans each year, with a maximum loan of \$1,000 per student in any academic year and a total maximum of a \$4,000 outstanding loan to any one student.

The loan-insurance program would eventually be self-financing, with the participating colleges and universities paying insurance premiums into a revolving fund established in the United States Treasury, out of which 80 percent of the loss on each insured student loan would be paid. One million dollars is the initial authorization for this fund. The interest rate charged the student would be geared to the average interest paid on marketable United States Treasury obligations. The institution would be permitted to charge the student this rate plus an additional amount of not more than 1 percent, plus the insurance premium charged by the Federal Government.

The student would not have to start repaying the principal of his loan until 4 years after he completes his education, and then would be given an additional 6 years to repay it. The institution could charge an additional 1 percent interest beginning at the time payments on the principal become due. Not contemplated in previously proposed legislation in this field is a form of compensation for the loan which emphasizes a point I have stressed earlier: the teacher shortage.

In its report, Teachers for Tomorrow, issued a year ago, the Fund for the Advancement of Education pointed out that about one-fifth of all 1954 graduates of 4-year colleges entered schoolteaching. But during the next 10 years one-half of all college graduates of every variety would have to enter schoolteaching in order to fill our needs, even assuming a high projection of college graduates.

In other words, one-fifth of the number of students graduated would enter the teaching profession, but 50 percent are needed. Obviously, we are not going to obtain that percentage, but we can do what is possible to close the gap.

Mr. President, a special feature of this bill is an incentive to graduates to enter the teaching profession, by forgiving the average amount of money borrowed by the student in any one academic year for

every full academic year of teaching which the graduate completes in a public or private secondary school or in an institution of higher learning.

In other words, if the graduate borrowed \$4,000 and then taught for 1 year, one-quarter of his loan would be forgiven. If he taught for 4 years, all of his loan would be forgiven. That would give a person an incentive to enter upon a teaching career.

Thus a student awarded a loan to advance his education may repay the loan in part or in full by teaching. It may reasonably be expected, too, that the Government scholarships which require no repayment—those to especially gifted needy students—may also yield the country a new, badly needed supply of instructors and professors in the higher institutions of learning. Thus, in this feature the bill seeks to achieve two goals: provision for education of the gifted by scholarships, and of the worthy by loans, and the consequent increase of our teacher personnel from both groups. Loan repayments may be forgiven by teaching in primary schools, in secondary schools, or in colleges. If this phase of the project works out as contemplated, we shall have gone a measurable way toward easing our teacher shortage, at least in its more acute emergency stages.

#### INCOME-TAX CREDIT

Mr. President, up to this point the scope of this proposed legislation has helped to build schools. It has opened the door of higher learning to our youth. It has given consideration to the new needs of higher institutions of learning for facilities assistance. It has made a hopeful dent in the teacher shortage.

At this point the proposed legislation reaches out beyond the student, and includes the parents, in an overall attack on the problems of financial hardship and inducement. Embodied in my next bill, the Educational Tax Credit Act of 1957, is a 30-percent credit against the income tax for payments made by the taxpayer to educational institutions during the taxable year for the cost of tuition and fees for students above the 12th grade. A \$450 limit is imposed on this tax credit per year.

This provision, in other words, would permit any individual to charge off against his net income tax 30 percent, but not to exceed \$450 in any taxable year, of the cost of tuition and fees which that person may pay for the education of himself or any other person.

In other words, Mr. President, if a citizen has an income tax of \$1,000, and if he has paid \$450 in college tuition for his son or daughter, the taxpayer will subtract the \$450 from his tax. Under the bill there will be a maximum credit of \$450, because those who can afford to send students to much more expensive institutions are generally persons of higher income and greater means. This program is directed toward inducing parents in the middle-income group and the lower-income group to send their sons and daughters to college, and to help contribute to their college education. When the parents make

a contribution toward such college education up to a maximum of \$450 a year, they will be entitled to that payment as a tax credit.

Some persons no doubt will say that this bill will cost a great deal of revenue. I have investigated that situation, Mr. President. In a larger sense, the bill will not cost any revenue at all, of course, because the way to create revenue is to create brainpower; and if, as a result of enactment of the bill, a number of additional trained students graduate from college, we may expect greater income for the Nation.

Mr. President, I believe the purpose of this bill is self-evident. Both as an inducement for higher education and as a relief measure for the family budget, we shall be removing a serious handicap for many American families by enacting this bill. It is similar to proposed legislation already pending before the House Ways and Means Committee. I introduced the bill in the hope that Senate committee consideration may begin prior to House action.

#### YOUTH OPPORTUNITY

So much, Mr. President, for the formal educational aspects of the proposed legislation I introduce today. Earlier in my remarks, I stressed that there were non-academic aspects of our youth problem, as well. No one can concern himself with the field of youth opportunity without considering our mounting national problem of juvenile delinquency. This whole area has been given careful consideration by Congress in previous sessions. One of the misfortunes of the 84th Congress was the failure of the House of Representatives to act upon S. 4267, a bill which passed the Senate.

In the report on that bill by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare of the Senate are statistics that provide a harrowing picture. The testimony before the committee showed that 1 out of every 13 children in the Nation between 10 and 17 years of age was in trouble with the law in 1954. About 1½ million, this testimony reported, were picked up by the police. Of these, the police referred 335,000 to the juvenile courts. This group, together with the 140,000 coming to court from other sources, made a total of 475,000 appearing in court. More than 40,000 were committed to training schools for delinquent youth.

We have it on the basis of this report that "unless the spiraling increase in juvenile delinquency can be arrested, the number of children between the ages of 10 and 17 getting into trouble with the police will increase to 2 million by 1960."

The first move, of course, is to prevent youngsters from taking the first misstep. We should anticipate and prevent. The second move is to help out of trouble the youngsters who have gotten into it, and put them on the road, as last year's report puts it, to "rehabilitation and useful citizenship." The checking of all this is well within the compass of Federal legislation. Juvenile delinquency, as last year's report made clear, is not a big-city problem. The evil increased 58 percent nationwide between 1948 and 1954. But the number of juvenile offenders appearing in courts serving populations of

less than 100,000 increased 63 percent in the same period. And juvenile crime is not confined to slums.

What I am saying is that the problem is Federal in scope, and needs Federal attention, as well as State and local attention.

Consequently, Mr. President, I reintroduce the Delinquent Children's Act because it is a superb proposal, dealing on a highly enlightened level with a problem that concerns us all. Here, as in the related measures I have been itemizing, the broadest possible allowances are made for local direction, local autonomy, and local decision. A Federal Advisory Council on Juvenile Delinquency is created in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Its function is to advise the Secretary and to present programs for decreasing the delinquency problem and for its control and treatment. The Council is to submit an annual report, and such other reports as it deems fit, in discussing the problem, the progress made in attacking it, and recommendations for the future. The bill authorizes the Council to comment upon applications for special projects, and authorizes the Secretary to utilize the services of Council members. Appropriations are authorized for State and local programs. These call for \$5 million for the fiscal year 1958; \$7,500,000 for the fiscal year 1959; and \$10 million for the fiscal year 1960; and for each of the following 4 fiscal years, such sums as the Congress may determine.

The allotments to each State are to be made on the basis of the ratio its child population bears to the total child population of all the States. Each State is to be permitted a minimum allotment of \$50,000. For the first year that the bill is in force, there is authorization for the appropriation of \$5 million for the purpose of making grants for the training of personnel in nonprofit institutions of higher learning and for developing courses for such training.

Other financial provisions made in the bill are customary in legislation of this nature. These seek to make its administration economical and fair to all the States and the Federal Treasury, and are aimed at fulfilling the major purpose of diminishing, controlling, and treating juvenile delinquency in the United States. The Secretary is thus authorized to render technical assistance to the States, to disseminate reports and information, and to give out the results of investigations. The Secretary may make payments under this title in advance or by way of reimbursement.

Mr. President, it is my earnest hope that the Senate will proceed to the speedy repassage of the Delinquent Children's Act, and that the House will concur during the present session of Congress.

Mr. President, my colleagues will recall that former Senator Herbert Lehman, of New York, our esteemed friend, was the sponsor of this measure, and reported it to the Senate, which passed it. Before he left Washington, I talked with Senator Lehman, and asked him whether I might reintroduce this bill. He gladly

consented. Hence, I am glad to say that I have done so with his blessing.

#### YOUTH CONSERVATION

Mr. President, the Delinquent Children's Act itself recognizes the fact that we have come into an age enlightened enough to treat the misdemeanors and felonies of children, not on the basis of punishment, but on the basis of prevention and rehabilitation. No child is born delinquent. We believe as we do not only for the sake of the children, who, of course, come first in our calculations, but also for the sake of the kind of society in which we want to live. This is the motivating factor behind all of the youth opportunity programs which I present today.

Our purpose must always be to provide a healthy avenue for the outlet of youthful energies. Youngsters must be given an opportunity to enjoy their youth, while at the same time serving productive purposes. One of the great seed ideas of our generation was the Civilian Conservation Corps. All of us know it as one of the most successful programs of its kind in the history of this form of legislation.

Mr. President, back in the 1930's some of our most able citizens went into the CCC camps, as boys. Members of Congress by the dozens were then young men, back in the 1930's, in the CCC camps; they will testify to the effectiveness of that program. It may be a useful concept for us to restudy, in our efforts to provide a youth opportunity program in a climate of achievement and well-being.

Mr. President, it is with all this in mind that I introduce my fifth bill today, entitled the Youth Conservation Act of 1957. The bill will establish a Youth Conservation Commission consisting of representatives of the National Park Service, the United States Forest Service, the Soil Conservation Service, and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The Commission will do three things:

First. Study the practicability and advisability of using programs for the conservation of natural resources, including forest-stand improvement, forest insect and disease control, streambed stabilization, park construction and improvement, wildlife cover improvement, public recreational facilities construction and improvement, and other similar programs, as a means of providing training for young men.

Second. Advise the Director of the pilot Youth Conservation Corps established under this title with respect to the programs carried on by, and the operation of such corps, and study and evaluate such programs and operation for the purpose of making recommendations with respect to the continuation and expansion of such corps.

Third. Report the results of its study and pilot Youth Conservation Corps experience, together with its recommendations, to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, for transmittal, not later than January 1, 1959, to the President and the Congress. In making its study, the Commission shall give consideration to cooperation with State agencies in State conservation projects, and



shall consider the advisability of using the Youth Conservation Corps for personnel recruitment and training for Federal conservation activities.

The Youth Conservation Corps, mentioned above, will operate as a pilot project under the supervision of a Director, appointed by the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The Director will have authority:

First. To establish and carry out a program for the corps in order to carry out the purposes of this act;

Second. To formulate rules and regulations for the operation of the corps;

Third. To appoint, without regard to the civil-service laws and regulations, the principal subordinate officials of the corps; and to appoint, in accordance with the civil-service laws and regulations, such other civilian personnel as he deems necessary for the efficient and economical discharge of the functions of the corps, the compensation of all such appointees to be fixed in accordance with the Classification Act of 1949, as amended;

Fourth. To enter into agreements and otherwise cooperate with the National Park Service, of the Department of the Interior; the Forest Service, of the Department of Agriculture; and with other departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the Federal Government, and with States and political subdivisions thereof, as well as with private organizations, in carrying out the purposes of this act; and

Fifth. To formulate such other rules and regulations, establish such other procedures, enter into such contracts and agreements, and generally perform such functions as he may deem necessary or desirable to carry out the provisions of this title.

Mr. President, under this bill the initial enrollment of the corps shall be not more than 500 persons and shall be open to unmarried male citizens of good character and good health, between the ages of 16 and 19 years. In order to enroll, any such person must agree to comply with the rules and regulations promulgated by the director for the government of the members of the corps.

(b) Enrollment in the corps shall be for a period of 1 year or such lesser time or times—including vacation periods for study—as may be established by the Director.

In addition to compensation of \$75 a month, enrollees will be furnished with such quarters, subsistence, equipment, medical services, and hospital services as the Director may deem necessary or appropriate for their needs.

The bill authorizes \$1 million for the fiscal year 1958, and such amounts thereafter as the Congress may determine to be necessary to carry out the provisions of the act.

Mr. President, what I am trying to do is establish a few of these conservation corps camps as pilot projects, not necessarily modeled on the CCC, because that was established for a period which has long since passed. I hope the Commission will work with State, Federal, and private voluntary agencies to help establish pilot youth camps, so that young men between the ages of 16 and

19 can work in the forests and parks and contribute something constructive to our country, and something good for themselves in terms of their physical, mental, and spiritual health.

It is suggested that this program be tried on an experimental basis for a few large cities which have serious juvenile delinquency problems. The opportunity to work out of doors at useful tasks under the supervision of men of good influence would open up horizons not heretofore available to underprivileged youngsters.

I have even thought we could utilize the services of high school or college athletic directors who are not employed full time in the summer, and thus enable them to supplement their income and to aid the young men who would have this great experience of outdoor activity. If we will recall our own youth, we will remember the sense of admiration we had for our football, basketball, or baseball coach or the youth director in our community groups. These men could be mobilized as a part of a great corps of instructors.

All I am asking is that the Federal Government concentrate its attention on working with State, local, and private groups in establishing these pilot youth conservation projects, where God's finest product, His young, and the wonders of nature can work together. When that happens we shall have some improvement in the general physical and emotional health of our young people.

A greater degree of self-reliance, of practical know-how in getting along in the out-of-doors and with other people, a release from destructive idleness to constructive activity, would be some of the important results which could be expected. This bill provides an investment in America's future we cannot afford to pass up.

In summary, Mr. President, the purpose of this youth-opportunity program is to supplement existing agencies, both private and public, in the job of furnishing the Nation with a body of citizens prepared to master the problems they and their children are bound to inherit. In the deepest imaginable sense, it is a national defense program on the educational, preventive, and rehabilitative levels to provide for the survival of a free society.

I propose to open the door to higher education in America for every American with intellectual qualifications—the uniquely gifted and the competent alike—whose financial limitations now render this impossible.

The purpose of the youth-opportunity program is not to emphasize one phase of our educational lack to the neglect of another, and thus produce some overplus or imbalance 4 or 8 or 12 years hence. The intent of the composite of measures encompassed in the bills is to provide a balanced program, augmenting what we already have, and fitted to the conditions we are seeking to cure and the national misfortune we propose to avert.

I seek to build schools.

I seek to provide scholarships, by Government appropriation.

I seek to provide, for the institutions where the scholarships are to be exer-

cised, added facilities compatible with the institutional needs the scholarships create.

I seek by a simple and practical devise of loan and inducement to help eliminate the present desperate teacher shortage.

I seek to provide liberal tax write-offs for parents who send their children to higher institutions of learning.

I seek to attack our problem of juvenile delinquency, both by prevention and rehabilitation.

I seek to provide healthy out-doors, constructive work for boys in the late teens—conservation projects in our national parks and forests.

This youth opportunity program provides the Senate of the United States with an opportunity to accept its responsibility on an extremely crucial and compelling front involving the Nation's greatest single asset—its youth. We could, through these proposals, discharge a long-delayed duty to our Nation by acknowledging our responsibility to youth and to the future. From another aspect, we could do here for the youth of America what we have already accepted as our responsibility in the matter of retired workers and the aged. With these measures we could complete the cycle of properly utilizing Government, within the limits of the principle of personal initiative and private property, for the public welfare.

Great issues at home and abroad confront our people. It is my conviction that, with the adoption of this youth opportunity program, history could well say that the Senate of the United States accepted one of the major challenges now facing the Nation.

Mr. President, I send to the desk 6 bills, the 5 I have summarized, and an omnibus measure combining them all.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHURCH in the chair). The bills will be received and appropriately referred.

The bills, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, were received, read twice by their titles, and referred as indicated:

To the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

S. 867. A bill to provide for assistance to and cooperation with States in strengthening and improving State and local programs for the diminution, control, and treatment of juvenile delinquency.

To the Committee on Finance:

S. 868. A bill to provide a 30-percent credit against the Federal individual income tax for amounts paid as tuition or fees to certain public and private institutions of higher education.

To the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

S. 869. A bill to establish a program of scholarship aid and long-term loans to students in higher education and to provide facilities assistance to institutions of higher education;

S. 870. A bill to authorize Federal payments to the States to assist in constructing schools;

S. 871. A bill to study the use of conservation programs to provide healthful outdoor training for young men and to establish a pilot Youth Conservation Corps; and

S. 872. A bill to provide school construction assistance to the States; to establish a program of scholarship aid and long-term loans to students in higher education; to

provide facilities assistance to institutions of higher education; to provide a 30 percent credit against the Federal individual income tax for amounts paid as tuition or fees to certain public and private institutions of higher education; to provide for assistance to and cooperation with States in strengthening and improving State and local programs for the diminution, control, and treatment of juvenile delinquency; to study the use of conservation programs to provide healthful outdoor training for young men; to establish a pilot Youth Conservation Corps; and for other purposes.

#### THE 1957 BUDGET

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, recently President Eisenhower submitted to Congress his unparalleled and monstrous 1957 budget for spending the money of this country's taxpayers.

In this budget he seeks more money for more giveaway programs. He seeks relief for unfriendly nations. He seeks funds for ungrateful lipservice allies. He seeks money for the agricultural development of millions of acres of foreign arid lands. He seeks almost unlimited credit for people all over the globe.

I notice that the President does not seek any money for the needy farmers of this Nation.

This terrifying fiscal monster, which even frightened the Secretary of the Treasury who helped create it for the President, carries no additional relief at all for any American citizen.

Only the other day the President was asked by the press if he felt it could be cut. The President replied that if it could be cut, he wished the Congress would find out where and tell him.

Mr. President of the Senate, I am here to tell the President not only how to cut this budget and where, but also how to help halt the inflation he worries so much about and does nothing about, but talk.

I remember 4 years ago he abolished wage and price controls and said they were unnecessary. Then for 4 years wages and prices—the latter always several laps ahead of the former—spiraled and spiraled. Last fall the President said inflation was a thing of the past and had been halted. Yet, within 2 months after his reelection, he was before Congress making it the key battle cry of his state of the Union message.

But this was not inconsistent enough for the President. In the face of all his pleading with the American people to stop spending, he sent to us the biggest spending-spree budget of any peacetime President in the Nation's history—even bigger than former President Truman's Korean war budget.

Mr. President, I know of no President in my lifetime who has been so ambiguous in his statements, so inconsistent in his policies, so effortless in aiding the people of his own country, and so successful in helping foreign countries as Dwight D. Eisenhower.

The President asked us where this budget can be cut. Why he does not know is beyond me. It is his budget. He wants this spending orgy. He says he wants to halt inflation. He says he wants to reduce the bigness in Government. Frankly, he wants too much.

I think the first thing we should do is to cut taxes. That is where all the money Eisenhower is spending is coming from. I mention that because some people seem to have forgotten that fact.

If we want to stop a little boy from buying too much candy, we cut his allowance. In this case, let us cut the Federal income and give the little taxpayers a break.

As I have preached for many years, I think we should increase tax exemptions from \$600 to \$800 for the individual taxpayers. This is the place to begin.

Then we should reduce our iniquitous foreign aid giveaway programs. We are giving away billions to nations all over the globe. And for what? It has been aptly proven too many times that money spent on foreign economic programs with no true military purpose is resented and makes enemies rather than friends. The President, in my opinion, is attempting to accomplish in the Mideast, with American taxpayers' money, and at the risk of American military involvement, that which the British and the French would have accomplished at their own financial expense and with their soldiers. The Eisenhower policy in the Mideast has made a hero out of our enemy, little Hitler Nasser, at the expense of and to the humiliation of our best friends.

We should immediately halt pouring hard-earned tax dollars down such drain holes.

Mr. President, I cannot think of a worse slap in the face to the farmers of the Midwestern States, who are begging for help in their desert plight, than to have this Government give \$200 million to the Mideast for irrigation and water development projects, and in the same breath say that we cannot help our midwestern farmers as much as they should be helped.

But that is what we are doing. Last Sunday the Secretary of the Interior said on television that the proposed drought relief program of the administration for the Midwestern States was probably not enough to do the job but was enough for Government to do. I do not understand that type of philosophy. It seems we cannot do too much for antagonistic dictators of foreign countries but we can do too much for our own people.

In these Halls I have heard a great deal of criticism in my day of the New Deal and the Fair Deal. But under all those programs the welfare of the people of the United States was placed first, and not that of some foreign government, as is the case under the Eisenhower "raw deal."

We must cut taxes. We must cut down, not increase, foreign giveaway programs.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the *Record* as a part of my remarks an excellent article entitled "Ike's New Program," written by Henry Hazlitt, of *Newsweek*, and published in the January 21 issue of that magazine.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the *Record*, as follows:

#### IKE'S NEW PROGRAM

Mr. Eisenhower's state of the Union message is a curious document, praising free

enterprise and Government economy in general terms while recommending more Government controls and special spending.

His discussion of inflation was typical. He admitted the Government's duty not to become "profligate in its expenditures." But then he called upon business to "avoid unnecessary price increases" and upon labor to refrain from "wage increases that outrun productivity." He implied that, if these two groups do not exercise "self-discipline," the Federal Government might be forced to return to price and wage controls.

The truth is that Government policy, particularly fiscal and monetary policy, must bear nine-tenths of the responsibility for inflation. Businessmen could not get higher prices for their goods unless Government policy provided consumers with more money to buy the goods. Labor could not get excessive wage rates without bringing about unemployment unless Government policy pumped out enough new money and credit to pay higher wages and raise prices. And it is inconsistent for the Government to ask unions to refrain from higher wage demands while it retains a network of Federal statutes which make it almost impossible for employers to refuse to yield to higher wage demands.

#### INVESTIGATING THE FED

The President went on to recommend creation of a commission to inquire into the "nature, performance, and adequacy of our financial system." Any assumption that such a group would consist of disinterested experts without already formed conclusions, and that they would discover hitherto unknown truths, is unrealistic. Once membership of the commission is known, it should not be too difficult to make a shrewd guess concerning its findings. We will be fortunate indeed if the proposed commission does not advocate reforms that would only make inflation easier.

But the most important immediate decision before Congress, even from the economic point of view, is still the President's proposal for discretionary power to commit American troops to "protect the territorial integrity and political independence" of any Middle Eastern nation requesting aid against Communist "armed aggression." This proposal seems to be a belated effort to correct the disastrous blunder the administration made when it voted with Egypt and Soviet Russia in the U. N. to demand that Britain, France, and Israel, as "aggressors," withdraw from Egypt, and do so without any assurance whatever of a settlement of the Suez Canal problem or the problem of Egyptian-Israeli relations.

#### WHAT WE DID AT SUEZ

Had we kept out of the situation altogether (or had we at least insisted on a two-sided resolution for the withdrawal of British, French, and Israeli troops from Egypt at the same rate as Russian troops withdrew from Hungary), it is probable that the canal would now be under the control of the British and French, and that Nasser, instead of Eden, would be "discredited." As it is, Nasser has become impossible; the canal is still blocked; huge oil reserves are cut off and in grave peril of falling under Russian control. The President seems to be proposing to try to do with American money and at the risk of American lives the very things he prevented Britain, France, and Israel from doing with their own money and at the risk of their own soldiers' lives.

There is grave doubt, even so, that the lone-hand policy now proposed by the President is the best alternative left to us. A much better course might be our simple adherence to the Baghdad pact. In any case there is no need whatever to authorize a bigger and special foreign-aid program. Resumption of Suez Canal traffic and the enormously profitable oil production and oil flow will give the Middle East all the economic aid



it needs. If Congress does feel obliged to give the President discretionary power to commit foreign troops abroad, that power should be as restricted and temporary as it can be made. There is no good reason why every foreign crisis should lead to more powers for the executive branch at the expense of Congress—particularly when it is the executive branch's blunders that have helped to produce the crisis.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I believe this article well explains the ridiculous proposition now placed before the Congress by the President, as regards his budget, his foreign-aid program, and taxes.

Later I shall have more to say on foreign giveaway, on tax reductions, and our foreign policy. At this time I should like to congratulate the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] for his forthright and fearless statement before the joint committee meeting yesterday regarding the administration's foreign policy. I am glad that the Senator from Arkansas has placed the issue squarely before the people. I feel there has not been enough of such fearless discussion regarding the white-elephant policies that have been developed by the ivory-tower leaders of the present administration.

I feel that the gloves are now off, and I hope we shall see in this Congress a return at last to our own peoples' interest by reducing taxes and foreign-aid spending.

Should we fail in this endeavor, I fear for the future. The road down which we are heading is that which many a previous great nation has stumbled. Unless we turn back, we shall destroy the goose that is laying the golden egg.

I hope these remarks will be read by other Senators and by the public. I believe that consideration of this problem at this time will bear fruit in the future, in the form of a reduction in spending and giveaways to foreign countries, and a disposition to give greater consideration to our own needy people in the United States.

#### TRIBUTE TO JOSEPH K. CARSON

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on December 20, 1956, a distinguished public servant from the State of Oregon passed away in his sleep. I refer to Joseph K. Carson, who not only was a distinguished public figure in my State, but a very close and dear friend.

In the late campaign in Oregon he was chairman of the statewide veterans committee working in behalf of my reelection.

In behalf of Mrs. Morse and myself, I wish to express publicly in the RECORD the sentiments which we have already expressed privately to Myrtle Carson, the wife of Joseph Carson, and to the members of their family. I wish to express our very deep sympathy over this great loss which they and our State have suffered.

Because I think it is the most fitting tribute I could possibly pay to this great Oregonian, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, an editorial from the Oregonian of Decem-

ber 22, 1956, paying tribute to Joe Carson; also an editorial of December 21, from the Portland (Oreg.) Journal, likewise paying tribute to this great citizen of our State.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Oregonian of December 22, 1956]

JOSEPH K. CARSON, JR.

When Joseph K. Carson, Jr., took office as mayor of Portland in January 1933 he was largely unknown by the people he was to serve. Many questioned his ability to fill the shoes of the veteran George L. Baker, one of the greatest showmen in American municipal politics.

When he retired undefeated 8 years later, at the end of his second term, however, everyone knew him, and he rivaled Mr. Baker in public affection. He was the kind of man who naturally was called Joe, a man with a friendly grin on a cherub face. But he had proved in those 8 years also that he was an able executive.

A mayor could face no tougher test than Joe Carson surmounted in his 8 years of office. The depression was at its depth and free spending by Government agencies was prescribed as the cure. Democrat Carson, however, was critical of that phase of his party's national program. As nonpartisan chief of Portland he took the opposite tack, balanced the budget and reduced the debt from \$50 million to \$30 million. On top of that, the city during his administration started two farsighted improvement programs, sewage disposal and the Front Avenue project.

Mr. Carson was beset also by unprecedented violence in the labor field which he met with firmness and fairness. The longshore strike of 1934 was the most unpleasant event of his years in office, he said on retirement. The teamster goon cases, too, occurred during his administration.

Joe Carson served his country and community in many fields besides city hall. He was a soldier in both world wars, a member of the Maritime Commission from 1947 to 1950, a past State commander of the American Legion, and a worker in many civic enterprises. He will be remembered chiefly in Portland, however, as our mayor in a trying time, and as a likable, bouncy man whose nickname fitted him to perfection. It seems unjust of fate that death should claim him unexpectedly at the comparatively early age of 65.

[From the Portland (Oreg.) Journal of December 21, 1956]

#### CARSON REMEMBERED WITH AFFECTION

The passing of Joseph K. Carson brings to an end the career of a man who headed Portland's city government during one of its most turbulent periods and a man to whom politics was one of the most important parts of living.

Carson had considerable of the little giant about him and in or out of office his lance was set and he was tilting at something—sometimes at windmills but always at something.

For a man who had this deep and abiding love of politics, the satisfactions were few and far between. He lost races for the legislature, for Congress, and for the governor's chair and found his greatest success in the nonpartisan office of mayor.

This is an uneasy seat at best and being mayor during the depression years and the years of major strife on the labor front proved that little Joe was a fighter.

Probably most people have forgotten, but in those years when money was extremely dear, Carson reduced the city bonded debt some 25 percent.

It was during his years in office that some of the major reforms in city election practice were instituted. Among them were the numbering of city council positions and the primary elimination and November runoff system.

Prior to these changes, city council elections were something of a grab-bag affair with all candidates, in effect, running for all seats and the top men getting the vacancies.

The former mayor served with honor in two world wars and on the United States Maritime Commission.

He was combative but his fights rarely extended beyond the political arena. Those who knew Joe Carson remember him with affection.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I now wish to turn briefly to another subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon has the floor.

#### THE PRESIDENT'S RESOLUTION ON MIDDLE EAST POLICY

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I approach this subject with a sad and heavy heart, because in my judgment the subject matter involves the most important issue that will face this session of the Congress.

I refer to the resolution, known as the President's resolution on Middle East policy, which is pending for joint consideration before the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate.

Mr. President, this is not the first time I have raised my voice in opposition to the extension to the President of the United States of what amounts to in fact unlimited discretionary powers. This is not the first time I have raised my voice in defense of the Constitution of the United States as I understand the meaning of that great document.

Not so long ago, Mr. President, I stood on the floor of the Senate, almost alone, supported on that occasion by only two colleagues, in opposition to the extension of a similar blank-check authority to the President of the United States in the Formosa Straits.

I warned then, as I do today, that it would be a precedent to extend such powers to the President. I warn today that if we adopt this second precedent, it will lead to a third and a fourth and a fifth precedent.

It is of the utmost importance that the American people understand what is involved in the proposal. Confident am I that if they understood it and were given an opportunity to pass judgment by popular referendum on the subject now before Congress, it would go down to overwhelming defeat at the hands of the people of the country, who would die by the millions if we were to lead them into what appears to be the great danger of unnecessary war in the Middle East.

#### FORMOSA RESOLUTION

I know full well that when a Senator stands on the floor of the Senate and expresses the deep convictions I shall express this afternoon, and rededicates himself to the constitutional concepts as our Constitutional Fathers intended them, he must expect, until the people

get the facts, to be criticized, castigated, and misunderstood.

The record shows that when I protested the Formosa Resolution, it was said on the floor of the Senate that my position might endanger the security of the Seventh Fleet. It was said that the point of view I expressed followed the Communist line. As the record shows, I refused to dignify with an answer such attacks.

#### MIDDLE EAST RESOLUTION LACKS SUPPORTING EVIDENCE

I believe in meeting the merits of these issues. Therefore, the first point I wish to make this afternoon is that I am waiting for the first scintilla of evidence to be presented by the Secretary of State that there is any danger of an armed attack by the Soviet Union in the Middle East.

I say to the American people that the Secretary of State and the President of the United States telling them so does not make it so.

I have grown a little weary of the sanctimonious, pontifical, political, and hypocritical pronouncements of this administration in the field of foreign policy. In my judgment the time has come when the American people are entitled to know the facts, and all the facts, about American foreign policy. I believe they are entitled to know the facts, and all the facts, about why we find ourselves confronted with this situation in the Middle East.

That is why I so heartily joined the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] yesterday during the joint meeting of the Committees on Foreign Relations and on Armed Services, in the courageous and statesmanlike pronouncement he made, when he called upon the Secretary of State to supply us with a white paper on the events that led up to the debacle which now characterizes American foreign policy in the Middle East.

#### MIDDLE EAST SITUATION REQUIRES CAREFUL DELIBERATION

I wish to say to the American people, from this desk on the floor of the Senate, that all the forces of the reactionary press of this country, backing up this reactionary administration, will blaze in their headlines, "Emergency!" and will castigate those of us who urge that we take the time to find out the facts.

Whenever this administration wants to roll over us with a steamroller, as it is attempting to do again in this situation, it raises the cry, "Emergency! No time!" That cry is always raised.

Well, Mr. President, this administration has had plenty of time to change to a course of action which, in my judgment, would have given us an entirely different picture in the Middle East today if only it had changed that course of action.

I am not impressed by the testimony of the Secretary of State about emergency and urgency and the necessity, according to him, of avoiding so-called delay.

I want no more delay than is necessary to have that due deliberation which is required in order to get all the facts to the American people. I ask the American people: What do you know about

American foreign policy? The answer is that the average citizen knows very little about American foreign policy. That is so because, for the most part, the average American citizen has been fed the clichés and slogans and propaganda of this administration. He has not been told the facts behind American foreign policy. The line is taken that he must not be told those facts because such telling would disclose secrets, and the enemy might get those secrets; therefore, it is not safe to tell the facts to the American people.

Well, Mr. President, I believe that even my bitterest critic will give me credit for this, that I have no desire at any time to follow any course of action which will disclose publicly a true secret which would truly endanger the security of our country.

However, I wish to point out again that we have gone too far in America toward police state techniques, too far in keeping from the American people information they ought to have about this country's foreign policy.

I believe that the American people are entitled to the kind of white paper which the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] called for yesterday in committee, so that we might know the true situation in the Middle East before we in Congress are called upon to act.

During the historic debate which is about to open in the Senate of the United States, I shall raise my voice time and time again calling for all the facts.

#### CONGRESS MUST BE CONSTRUCTIVE AS WELL AS CRITICAL

I know of no time in my 12 years in the Senate when I have offered criticism without being willing at the same time to offer a constructive and affirmative program, as my judgment gives me the ability to see what I believe to be a constructive and affirmative program, to correct the problem I criticize. I believe I would fail in the public trust which I owe to the people of the sovereign State I represent if today in my first speech on the subject, I should offer criticisms of the Eisenhower resolution and not offer what I consider to be an affirmative and constructive substitute for the resolution.

Therefore, in this brief speech today, I offer, and will at the close of my remarks send to the desk, a substitute resolution which I believe will accomplish all the legitimate purposes of the President's resolution, and yet will keep faith with the pattern of our constitutional checks. At the same time it will serve clear notice on Russia that if she attempts military aggression against any free nation, she will have us to deal with, and also, I hope, with our allies.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I wonder whether the Senator from Oregon, during the course of his remarks, will read the text of his resolution into the RECORD, so that we may become familiar with what he is discussing and have the benefit of it in listening to the balance of his remarks.

Mr. MORSE. I shall discuss it in detail, section by section.

#### COMMUNIST MENACE REQUIRES CONCERTED ACTION FROM FREE NATIONS OF THE WORLD THROUGH UNITED NATIONS

Mr. President, I yield to no one in the Senate in my concern and fear about Russia's nefarious designs. I believe she is playing for the long pull of decades. I believe she intends over the long pull of the decades to follow courses of action which, she hopes, will finally subvert all the world to the totalitarianism of communism.

That is why I have been heard to say so many times—and I repeat it today—that I believe the free nations of the world should act in concert against this totalitarianism, and I believe they should act in concert through the United Nations, and not outside the United Nations.

One of my many criticisms of the Secretary of State is that his record is a sorry record of almost invariably, in the first instance, when a new crisis arises, of bypassing the United Nations, but finally, on some occasions, finding himself in a position where ultimately he has to try to operate through the United Nations.

When the Middle East crisis first arose, there were some of us who urged immediate action by the United Nations. We were told by the State Department and the White House that it was not the appropriate time. Subsequent events showed that it was not the appropriate time, apparently, because Mr. Dulles had not yet completed his manipulations, or attempted manipulations, to maneuver around the United Nations. But his actions boomeranged on him.

Several weeks after some of us had urged that the United Nations ought to be called upon to take jurisdiction in the matter, and had urged that the United States ought, by way of a resolution, to try to have called a special session of the General Assembly of the United Nations immediately following the call of the Security Council meeting to take cognizance of the problem, this administration did follow that course of action. But it was too late. I say "too late," because, in the meantime, we had affronted great allies. In fact, they apparently had so little confidence in the foreign policy of the United States and in those responsible for it that two of those great allies—Great Britain and France—acted and worked in secret, so far as the United States was concerned, in the Middle East.

#### MIDDLE EAST DEBACLE REVEALS FAILURE OF WHITE HOUSE AND STATE DEPARTMENT TO MAINTAIN THE CONFIDENCE OF OUR MAJOR ALLIES

I would have the American people remember what I say here this afternoon: If they want any proof as to the low ebb to which American foreign policy under the present State Department has sunk, they have only to keep in mind the fact that Great Britain and France acted in secret, so far as the American Secretary of State is concerned—and he so testified before our committee. He did not even know what Great Britain and France were up to. Only as late as the Saturday before the Monday when Israel revealed her intentions did our State Department have a suspicion, apparently, that Israel was up to some



drastic course of action, such as was shown by the mobilization of her forces.

Oh, Mr. President, a great vacuum was created in the Middle East. A part of the cause of that vacuum rests squarely on the doorstep of the White House itself and on the doorstep of the Secretary of State because of their delay, because of their failure, to use the position of American leadership in the world through the United Nations in respect to the Middle East crisis.

Now where are we? All the camouflage of language, all the pontifical pronouncements by the President and the Secretary of State will not change the fact that the United States now stands practically alone in the Middle East. That is evidenced by the fact that the slightest suggestion any of us have made in the hearings that the United States should see what can be done to get England and France to join with us and to pledge their boys, along with ours, to defend the Middle East against Soviet aggression is met by the Secretary of State with such vague answers and generalities as to indicate that he does not think such a proposal would be acceptable to other countries in the Middle East.

Have we reached the point where we are going to let other countries in the Middle East call the tune and determine for us who our allies will be under a program as drastic as the program proposed by the resolution which is under consideration? What kind of resolution is it? It proposes unilateral action on the part of the United States outside the United Nations. All the talk by the President of the United States and the Secretary of State in regard to article 51 of the United Nations Charter is a diversionary tactic, and they know it. Article 51 of the United Nations Charter does not in any way make the resolution an instrument of the United Nations. The resolution is a unilateral instrument of the United States acting outside the United Nations.

No matter what criticism befalls me, let me say on the floor of the United States Senate this afternoon that I shall never vote for a resolution which puts my Government in a position where unilaterally the United States pledges American boys to save the oil lines for Western Europe without a pledge at the same time by the nations of Western Europe to use their boys.

ADMINISTRATION PROPOSAL IS ACTUALLY PLEDGE TO PROTECT ARABIAN OIL WITH AMERICAN BOYS

I mentioned the oil lines. The American people had better face the reality. Some would call it the ugly fact. I call it the economic reality; the reality that, when all is said and done, the resolution, boiled down to its essence, means we are serving notice on Russia that she is not going to get the oil of the Middle East without a fight with us. That is what it means.

Mr. President, the resolution spells three letters—o-i-l. Let us take a look at the economic reality of those three letters.

The testimony before us is that the economy of Western Europe is dependent upon the maintenance of a supply of oil from the Middle East to Western

Europe. No one can doubt that. That is an economic fact. Cut from Western Europe the supply of Middle East oil, and in not too great a length of time the economy of Western Europe will be in a serious depression.

That will have direct effects upon the United States. The prosperity and the standard of living of the American people are dependent in some measure upon the economy of Western Europe. Certainly, we have learned in the last 20 years that we cannot live unto ourselves economically. Certainly, we have learned that we must look now upon the economics of the world as really the economics of both our front and back doors. I recognize that.

If Western Europe loses her supply of oil from the Middle East it will be necessary for the United States to supply the oil to her from our own resources—and they are limited; they will not last in perpetuity. If we supply Western Europe with our oil, it will be at a terrific security cost to the United States.

Therefore, as a liberal, I say to the liberals of America from this desk today, "You cannot ignore the fact that the economic and political security of America is more dependent upon oil than some would like to admit."

But, Mr. President, is it our obligation alone? Is it our responsibility alone? Is it only American boys who are to be pledged to defend those oil lines? Not with my vote.

In the resolution, which I shall read shortly, I have a section which seeks to cover this point, because I think we have the right to call upon our allies in Western Europe to pledge that in case of Russian military aggression in the Middle East they will join with us in meeting that aggression.

I do not propose to let any Arab dictator exact from my Government a resolution which does not mention Western Europe, but mentions only a unilateral American pledge. I would have the Arab dictators keep in mind the fact that the economic and military program envisioned by the resolution is one which protects their survival; because without us, and without Western Europe, it would be only a matter of time, if Russia so decided, before they would find themselves under the conquering heel of communism.

ADMINISTRATION RESOLUTION WOULD PROTECT ARAB TOTALITARIANISM AT EXPENSE OF HUMAN FREEDOM

Speaking only hypothetically, and only for illustrative purposes, and not with the purpose of proposing it seriously, Mr. President, I would make this comment, however: Sometimes in reflection upon this problem, I say to myself, "I wonder whether it would not teach these Arab dictators something about the true meaning of human freedom and liberty if they had to spend a decade or two in the boiling oil of communism and totalitarianism, where human liberty and human freedom burn to ashes?"

Mr. President, there is nothing about the protection of human liberty and the dignity of the individual in the great majority of these Arab dictatorships, that causes me, figuratively speaking, to bleed at the heart for their survival. In

fact, Mr. President, something can be said in criticism of an American policy which seems always to find itself in a position where it is protecting and securing totalitarianism of the Fascist monarchical type. I happen to think that the police-state techniques of Fascist dictatorships and absolute monarchical dictatorships closely resemble the techniques of the police-state methods of communism, because there is no dignity for the individual under any kind of dictatorship.

So, Mr. President, let us face it: When we make the pledge under the resolution, for the most part we are pledging to make secure, in so far as governments are concerned, shocking dictatorships in the Arab world. In the entire area, perhaps the only state of which it can be said that human freedom is protected to the degree that we in this country seek to protect it, is the State of Israel, a child of the United Nations; a country for whom I hold no brief, in so far as its transgressions against the United Nations Charter are concerned, but a country whose transgressions can better be understood if we take the time to study the provocations which led to them; and a country which today is greatly concerned about this resolution because it does not provide a single guarantee to the protection of Israel from invasion by the Arab States.

The only protection is a guaranty that if Israel were about to be overrun by military action by Russia, we would go to Israel's assistance. Certainly I think that as of now, that danger is most remote. In fact, without disclosing committee confidence that I am not permitted to disclose, I will say in this broad, general statement that in recent days I have listened to testimony of expert witnesses, representatives of our Government, who have had long experience in the Middle East; and when I asked one of them, "Do you think there is any present danger of a military attack on the part of the Soviet Union against any Middle East country?" I received the only reply which any facts which have been submitted to us to date justify; and the reply was "No."

Yet the Secretary of State takes the stand, crying "Wolf, Wolf" again, talking about urgency and emergency, seeking to frighten the American people into believing that if the resolution is not adopted as of yesterday, we shall be jeopardizing the security of the United States.

Mr. President, we in political life know part of that strategy. Part of the strategy is to try to scare the constituents back home; and then when a voice is raised in protest of an administration policy, the hope is that the speaker will be flooded with letters and telegrams in which he is urged to back the President. Then, when we respectfully ask our constituents, "What do you know about the President's proposal," they are quick to confess that they do not know about it, but they think it should be taken on faith.

Mr. President, I did not take the oath of office at your desk to take on faith any proposal of any President of the United States, and I do not intend to do

so. I will take my positions in the Senate on the basis of what I honestly believe the facts to be. When a President does not give me the facts, I intend to do the best job I can of smoking out the facts.

Mr. President, I have pointed out that under the President's resolution, there first would be unilateral action on the part of the United States. Secondly, under the President's resolution, there would be a pledge of the use of American boys, if necessary, to protect the oil lines so vital to the economy of Western Europe. In the third place, Mr. President, I have pointed out that the states we seek to protect and make secure are, for the most part, totalitarian. In fact, in some of them the institution of human slavery still exists. I wonder whether that is why this administration has not seen fit to join in an international compact against human slavery.

Mr. President, there once lived a great American by the name of Abraham Lincoln, who symbolizes in American history the ideal that the American people do not stand for human slavery. This administration can roll out the carpet, if it wants to, to foreign dignitaries from totalitarian governments that still foster human slavery; but I do not propose to pay them either public or private homage, because I say that in this battle for freedom around the world, it still is not too late for my country to make clear to the millions of people among whom this fight for freedom is to be won that we believe in practicing the ideals we profess. But, Mr. President, we do not practice the ideals we profess when we follow a course of action in the Middle East that tacitly underwrites or countenances or tolerates an institution of human slavery.

Then the resolution, in the fourth place, Mr. President, proposes economic aid to these Arab countries. Mr. President, let me say to the taxpayers of America that the resolution proposes the making of grants to these Arab countries. That is why some of us, in asking our questions, in recent days, of the Secretary of State, stressed a point which I wish to stress in this speech, namely, the importance of implementing any resolution we adopt with a condition that where the wealth of the country concerned permits of it, the aid shall be in the form of loans, not grants. Mr. President, I say that because, as I put in the record of the hearings yesterday afternoon, the wealth of many of these countries is tremendous. I asked, through the staff of the Foreign Relations Committee, to have the Library of Congress prepare for me an analysis of the potential revenues from oil of the group of Arab countries which have great oil reserves. I placed that analysis in the hearing record. Mr. President, do you know how much it is? Based upon 1955 production and 1955 prices it is \$98,400,000,000. Mr. President, I say to President Eisenhower, "Tell this to the taxpayers of the United States." I say to Secretary of State Dulles, "Modify your resolution, because you cannot in good conscience, you cannot from the standpoint of political morality, justify asking the American

people to grant taxpayer dollars to Arab countries which have a potential revenue from oil of \$98,400,000,000."

Mr. President, if the President thinks he can, let him submit this matter to a referendum of the American people. There is no urgency about it. Let us have a public debate for 2 weeks. Then let us set a special election in the United States, and let the President take the question to the people of the country. Then some interesting questions will be asked of him; he will be asked why there has been such a change in his talk subsequent to November 6, as compared with what he had to say on this matter prior to November 6.

No, Mr. President, this is an oil resolution. Oil is vital to the economic prosperity of Western Europe and of the United States, but even oil can cost too much, and I do not propose to pay for it the price of human liberty and freedom. I do not propose to sacrifice an ideal of human dignity. I do not propose to support unilateral action on the part of this President or any other President because oil is worth so much economically. What does it profit a man if he loses his ideals, Mr. President, but keeps a high standard of living? In the judgment of history, Mr. President, he will be condemned if he follows that course of action.

#### ADMINISTRATION RESOLUTION IGNORES GRAVE CONSTITUTIONAL QUESTION

I turn to my fifth and last point before I present the resolution, Mr. President. I have already alluded to it. It is a constitutional question. The Secretary of State, under examination, admitted that the Congress cannot delegate the power to declare war. But he is a very interesting witness. After making that admission, then, typical of his testimony, he seeks to divert attention away from that admission by saying, "Wars are not declared any more, after all. A state of war is upon us, and what we do is recognize that a state of war exists."

One gets the impression, Mr. President, that that was something new in international relations. But the fact is, as I pointed out, in the hearings, that in each and every one of the recent wars in which we have participated in recent decades, save and except the Korean war—and it was a mistake not to do it then, and I said so the next day after the troops were ordered into Korea, and I said so on the side of the aisle opposite from the side on which I now stand, as the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will show—there was a declaration of war by the Congress of the United States. Certainly, attacks have been made upon us as at Pearl Harbor, and by the policies of Hitler, but even so we passed a formal declaration of war when we resisted them.

How important that is in our constitutional system, because it is at that point, Mr. President, that the constitutional fathers guaranteed to the American people a check upon the President of the United States. The remark might be made, "Oh, Mr. Senator, you speak hypothetically, speculatively. It must be assumed that when the situation of an attack exists, a declaration

of war is going to follow." I think so, too, Mr. President. Yet it is of vital importance that the Congress exercise that check, because it is conceivable that something might happen to these democratic processes of ours in the decades ahead whereby, sometime in the future, we might have a President against whom that check should be exercised. But here, Mr. President, as I said in the hearings and as I said at the time of the discussion of the Formosa Resolution—the President is asking for predated action by the Congress of the United States. He is asking for approval in advance. He is asking for a blank check, knowing that if he gets it, whatever decision he renders, Congress will consider itself estopped from imposing a check. I think that is constitutionally dangerous. I have not changed my opinion, since the debate on the Formosa Resolution, as to the constitutional aspects of the request. Oh, I know, Mr. President, we shall never get the question before the Supreme Court squarely for a decision; but I am satisfied that, from the standpoint of constitutional law, we do not have the constitutional authority to give a President a blank check to commit an act of war.

There is another facet of this constitutional question, which the transcript of the record will show, about which the Secretary of State was particularly evasive. I put the question in the form of a hypothesis. I put it in the RECORD today. Suppose, Mr. President, that a President of the United States, under his emergency powers, orders American troops into combat prior to a declaration of war. Does the Congress of the United States have the constitutional authority to rescind that action, or is it limited, under the Constitution, to the procedure of impeaching the President?

I respectfully submit, Mr. President, that, under the Constitution of the United States, the Congress has the authority to order the troops back home. If the President does not recognize and accept that action of Congress, then, and only then, the question arises as to whether or not he is in such defiance of the constitutional rights of the Congress that an action for impeachment might exist.

So you will see, Mr. President, as I read my resolution, that I have covered this constitutional point because I want to make clear that I recognize, and have always recognized, and have argued many times on the floor of the Senate in the last 12 years, that the President of the United States has broad inherent emergency powers, but they are not absolute, and that, as Commander in Chief, he has the duty and the obligation and the power to proceed to protect America's vital interests anywhere in the world until such time as he can get his course of action before the Congress for review and approval. He does not have absolute power. Our constitutional fathers were very careful to see to it that a President of the United States did not get absolute power. Do not forget, they had just come out of some sorry experiences with a line of kings that exercised absolute power, and they revolted against that tyranny.



You see, Mr. President, I am talking here about a constitutional abstraction of vital importance to the welfare of the American people in terms of constitutional history. I am raising my voice today, as I will in the weeks ahead, forewarning the American people that these precious checks of the Constitution should not be given up for a Dwight Eisenhower or any other President of the United States at any time. So, I think it is important, Mr. President, that when the President exercises his emergency powers he proceed forthwith to present the reasons for his course of action to the Congress, giving the Congress the opportunity then to check his course of action.

Mr. President, that is not what the administration leaders want. When this problem is put to Secretary Dulles, Mr. President, he makes clear that is not what they want. And that is all the American people should need to know. I think all the American people need to do is read the testimony of John Foster Dulles on this point, and then give the Eisenhower administration their clear answer: "We want to back you up," as I want to back him up, "but we insist on backing you up under the checks of the Constitution. We are against giving to any President a blank check and unbridled power such as the discretionary authority provided for in the resolution would give to this President." Thus, in my resolution I cover that point.

ADMINISTRATION REQUEST COULD RESULT IN AN ATTEMPT AT PREVENTIVE WAR BY AMERICAN GOVERNMENT

The last point I wish to make is with regard to the preventive-war issue. I am very grateful to the Secretary of State for the statement he made this morning in answer to a series of questions I put to him in regard to the preventive-war issue. But his statement this morning is different from his testimony in closed session at the time of the Formosa Resolution. That is the point I wish to drive home.

At the time of the Formosa Resolution the Secretary of State and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff favored and testified in support of a power to order an armed assault against the mainland of China before an act of aggression had been committed against the United States by Red China. Of the many reasons why I took the position I took against the Formosa Resolution, that was the most controlling. But the American people did not know about it at the time. The people of my State did not know about it at the time. I suppose that never in the political history of the State of Oregon was a United States Senator so castigated, attacked, and abused in a reactionary press than in my case in respect to the Formosa Resolution. My political enemies licked their chops. They thought, "Now we have him." But what they overlooked was the intelligence, the fairness, and the understanding of the great electorate of Oregon once they got the facts. So when, in the late campaign, up and down that State, I challenged this administration to send into the State anyone it wished to send to debate with me the Formosa Resolution—because it was

perfectly obvious that my opponent would not discuss it—I was met with silence. It was perfectly obvious that once the people of Oregon came to understand that what this administration proposed behind closed doors was an authority given to the President to order a strike against the mainland of China if he should decide it was necessary, they recoiled.

I remember that when I cross-examined the Secretary of State in those hearings upon that subject he replied, "What would you do if an air force on the mainland of China was about to take off the ground and fly to places where it would jeopardize vital American interests?" In essence, I asserted that I would stay within the framework of international law, and I would have my air force powerful enough to meet the enemy at the point of aggression; but I would not propose to make an outlaw nation of my country.

Had we followed the original plans of the administration under the Formosa Resolution, to defend Quemoy and the Matsus, we would have been an outlaw nation, and for the first time in our glorious history we would have committed an aggressive act of war, and the rest of the world would have condemned us.

I have been worried about this resolution on this score, knowing the position that Dulles and Radford took on the Formosa Resolution. So this morning I asked the Secretary of State, by way of a hypothetical example, if it was his position that in this case a concentration of military might within the Soviet Union prior to an act of aggression would justify or empower the President to order an attack upon such concentration of power. I was pleased and grateful to get the answer, "No; the resolution would not cover that situation, or grant the President that power."

However, I was disappointed that the Secretary of State hedged when I discussed with him the position which he took at the time of the Formosa Resolution. He did the hedging; I did not. So I say here on the floor of the Senate this afternoon that the record of the committee hearings sustains the position I took. So far as I am concerned, I welcome making the record available to the American people. It ought to be made available. There was no reason at the time why it should not have been made available.

As my colleagues know, I think too many transactions relating to our foreign relations are conducted in secrecy. There is no cause or need for it. We can protect the security of the country without keeping from the American people as much as we do about the foreign policy and military position of the United States. I have served on both the Armed Services Committee and the Foreign Relations Committee. In my judgment, 80 or 85 percent of the information which is kept behind closed doors ought to be made available to the American people. Such information involves their foreign policy and their military. It does not belong to the President. It does not belong to the Joint Chiefs of Staff. It belongs to a free peo-

ple, and they ought to have it. If they had it, there would be many changes in American governmental policy. Of that I am convinced, as I am convinced that if they had all the facts behind this administration resolution, that resolution would be drastically amended before it passed the Senate.

MORSE RESOLUTION

In conclusion, I turn to my substitute resolution. Section 1 of the resolution expresses the support of Congress of the declared policy of the United States to use its power and influence to preserve peace in the Middle East, and it states that it is the sense of the Congress:

(a) That the President should embark on a long-range economic aid program for an area within and without the United Nations. It emphasizes the need for social and economic progress in the Middle East.

(b) The resolution proposes that the President take steps, through the United Nations and other means, to stop the arms race among the nations of the Middle East. It proposes that he seek the prohibition or control of arms shipments.

It proposes that in the event that any nation or group of nations in the Middle East is in danger of unprovoked armed attack, the President should undertake such military assistance programs as in his judgment may be necessary to deter or resist aggression, and should declare the determination of the United States to use arms in aid of a nation subjected to an unprovoked armed attack, with prior notice to the Congress. If an emergency prevents such notice, then the President should submit his action to the Congress forthwith for approval or disapproval. The resolution provides that the President should arrange with the free allies of the United States with vital interests in the area for their active military support in the event it becomes necessary to employ the Armed Forces of the United States. I dwell on the point that we should not be expected to "go it alone" militarily in the Middle East.

The resolution provides that the President should seek effective guaranties for passage on terms of equality through Suez Canal and Gulf of Aqaba.

The resolution provides that pending the conclusion of a peace treaty between Israel and the Arab States, the President should take steps, first, to reduce tensions between Israel and the Arab States; second, to stabilize their relations and prevent the use or threat of force in violation of the United Nations Charter; third, to resettle refugees; and, fourth, to keep United Nations police forces interposed between Israel and Egypt to guard the Gaza strip and the Gulf of Aqaba.

MIDDLE EAST SITUATION REQUIRES SETTLEMENT OF ITS LONGSTANDING POLITICAL PROBLEM

I digress long enough to point out that there are three great political issues in the Middle East which will have to be settled before there will be any hope for peace in the Middle East. One is the Suez Canal problem, which, when all is said and done, is naught but a problem of international law and rights. If we eliminate all the emotions, we find that the

fact is that the Suez Canal problem raises a question of the comparative and respective rights of certain powers which claim rights in the canal, principally Egypt, Great Britain, and France. There are others, but those are the three major ones.

What is so complex about the problem? We talk about a system of international justice through law. We talk about working toward the goal of mankind settling threats of war by resort to rules of reason. Where has my country been in the Middle East crisis over the Suez Canal? It has not been exercising the leadership it ought to exercise in the United Nations by pleading with the disputants to support a resolution submitting the respective international law rights either to the World Court and the judicial processes of that court, or to the mediation and arbitration procedure provided for within the United Nations.

I believe we ought to take note, that we have a second great political problem in the Middle East, the problem of the Arab refugees. More than a million fellow men and women are living under the most deplorable conditions in what can most kindly be described as detention camps. Whose responsibility is it? Is it the responsibility of Israel? Is it the responsibility of the Arab countries?

I happen to believe it is the responsibility of moral men and women around the world. I believe it is the responsibility of every human being who believes that we ought to practice the great spiritual teachings which characterize us as a moral Nation, and that the spiritual mandate that we are our brother's keeper is not a cliché, spiritually or politically.

I believe that all free men have some moral obligation in connection with the Arab refugee problem. When I think of the millions of dollars we spend around the world for one cause or another, it is not asking too much that we exercise our leadership in an attempt to get the free nations to join in attempting to get Israel and the Arab countries to come to some humanitarian and moral settlement of the Arab refugee problem, and to lead them economically. I believe that the American people generally would be very glad, indeed, to contribute some of their tax dollars to the solution of that problem; and that they would recognize that those dollars might have a better chance of promoting peace than the dollars spent for jet planes sent to Pakistan, or to any Arab state.

We must face the Arab refugee problem. I certainly believe that when we adopt the resolution, we should serve notice, at least on the Arab States and on Israel, that we intend to use the position of our leadership in the world to seek to get them to enter into a treaty at an early date for the settlement of this problem.

Next, Mr. President, we have the political problem in the Middle East of the protection of the boundaries and territorial integrity of Israel. From the distance of these many thousands of miles we Americans cannot ignore that problem, although it is easy to take that isolationist attitude. In Israel the people read almost weekly wild statements made by Arab dictators of their intention as

soon as possible to wipe the free State of Israel from the map. Then they read of a resolution which has as one of its purposes the supplying of military and economic aid, under the flexible discretion of the President of the United States, to Arab countries. Many of these people raise the question: "What assurance do we have that those guns will not be turned toward Israel, rather than the Soviet Union?"

Having said that, I wish to make clear, as I mentioned before, that I hold no brief for any violations of international law by Israel. However, I understand their provocation. That is why I propose the establishment of a buffer zone between Egypt and Israel and that we use our leadership to get the United Nations to man that buffer zone with a United Nations police force which will be an effective police force.

#### MORSE RESOLUTION INCLUDES ECONOMIC AID

Section 2 of the resolution authorizes the use of \$200 million of mutual security funds without restriction in the area.

I believe that with the other checks which I have provided in section 1 of the resolution, the President should be given that authority which he seeks.

Section 3 provides that a report be made by the President to Congress in January and July.

Section 4 provides that the resolution shall expire upon the vote of Congress.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the resolution be printed in the *RECORD* at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution will be printed in the *RECORD*.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 42) to promote peace and stability in the Middle East, introduced by Mr. MORSE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the *RECORD*, as follows:

#### Senate Joint Resolution 42

Joint resolution to promote peace and stability in the Middle East

Whereas the declared policy of the United States in its relations with other nations within and outside the United Nations is to develop and sustain just and enduring peace and security for all, in accordance with the purposes and principles of the United Nations and the provisions of the United Nations Charter;

Whereas there have been breaches of the peace and continuing threats to the peace in the Middle East which have not only disturbed the peace and security of the peoples of the area, but have obstructed the movement of vital commerce upon which the economies and welfare of not only countries in the area, but of many other countries throughout the world are dependent; and the continuance of these disturbed conditions in the Middle East creates an imminent threat not only to the peace and economic welfare of the area, but the peace of the world; and

Whereas imperialistic communism has exploited the disturbed political and economic conditions in the Middle East seeking not to allay but to stir up strife and unrest and seeking, by shipment of arms, by the proffer of volunteers, by economic inducements, by varied forms of internal subversion, and by other means to create and use governments in the Middle East as the witting or unwitting

instruments of its own imperialistic designs: Therefore, be it

*Resolved, etc.—*

SECTION 1. The Congress expresses its support of the declared policy of the United States to exert its power and its influence, within and outside the United Nations, to preserve peace and security in the Middle East, in accordance with the purposes and principles of the United Nations and the terms of the United Nations Charter, and in particular declares that it is the sense of the Congress:

(a) The President should devise and put into effect economic assistance programs including the support of programs of United Nations or other international agencies to cooperate with and assist nations or groups of nations in the Middle East dedicated to the maintenance of peace and independence to strengthen their economies and to improve their living standards. Such programs so far as feasible should be geared to sound long-range development which will provide the basis for orderly progress. Without orderly social and economic progress there can be no political stability in the Middle East, and without political stability there can be no stable peace.

(b) (1) The President should take steps through the United Nations, and by other means, to stop the arms race among the nations of the Middle East and to prohibit or rigidly control the shipment to them of arms not necessary for their self-defense. If, however, any nation or group of nations in the Middle East is in danger of unprovoked armed attack against its territorial integrity and political independence, the President should undertake such military-assistance programs with such nation or group of nations as in his judgment may be necessary to deter or resist aggression.

(2) Furthermore, in order to contribute to the maintenance of peace, the President should reaffirm, with particular reference to those areas in the Middle East the peace and security of which is vital to world peace and security, the determination of the United States to employ the Armed Forces of the United States, if necessary, in exercise of the right of individual or collective self-defense under article 51 of the United Nations Charter in the event of any unprovoked armed attack, provided that such employment shall be consonant with the Charter of the United Nations and actions and recommendations of the United Nations. Prior to the employment of Armed Forces the President shall give notice to Congress. If, in the judgment of the President, an emergency arises in which such notice to Congress is not possible, he shall upon the employment of Armed Forces forthwith inform Congress and submit his action for its approval or disapproval. Such employment of forces under article 51 shall be immediately reported to the Security Council, and the General Assembly and shall not in any way affect the authority and responsibility of the Security Council or General Assembly to take at any time such action as either body deems necessary in order to maintain or restore international peace or security. The President should arrange with the free allies of the United States with vital interests in the area for their active support in the event it becomes necessary to employ the Armed Forces of the United States.

(c) In order to assure all nations the equal protection of international law, and in furtherance of the traditional policy of the United States to foster international trade and the unobstructed international movement of the world's commerce, the President should take steps through the United Nations and by other means to secure effective international guarantees and safeguards of free and unimpeded passage on terms of equality, in war and in peace, through the Suez Canal and the Gulf of Aqaba for all nations.



(d) To safeguard world peace and security under the United Nations Charter pending the conclusion of a peace treaty between Israel and the Arab States the President should take steps through the United Nations and by other means (i) to reduce tensions between Israel and the Arab States, (ii) to stabilize their relations and prevent the use or threat of force in violation of the Charter, (iii) to resettle the refugees, (iv) to keep United Nations police forces interposed between Israel and Egypt to prevent border clashes and the remilitarization of the Sinai peninsula and the Gaza strip, and at critical areas about the Gulf of Aqaba to prevent the obstruction of commerce and navigation.

(e) The President should concert United States policy in the Middle East so far as is consistent with the purposes and principle of the United Nations Charter with the policy of other nations of the free world. When we invoke the Charter against our allies, we must see that they are protected in their rights under the Charter and international law;

SEC. 2. The President is hereby authorized, when he determines that such use is important to the security of the United States, to use for the purposes of this joint resolution, without regard to the provisions of any other law or regulation, not to exceed \$200,000,000 from any appropriation now available for carrying out the provisions of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended. This authorization is in addition to other existing authorizations with respect to the use of such appropriations.

SEC. 3. The President shall, within the months of January and July of each year, report to the Congress his action hereunder.

SEC. 4. This joint resolution shall expire when the Congress by a majority vote of both houses shall determine that the peace and security of the nations in the Middle East are reasonably assured by international conditions created by action of the United Nations or otherwise.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I close by saying in all sincerity that I have sought today to offer what I consider to be a constructive and affirmative program which will accomplish the legitimate objectives of the proposal of the President, but will provide those checks and restrictions and modifications which in my judgment the perpetuation of a sound constitutional system of government in the United States clearly requires.

I know there will be strong differences with the points of view I have expressed this afternoon. I am fully aware of the type of attack that will be made against me in some quarters for the position I have taken. However, let me make clear in closing that I believe Russia would fear much more the type of resolution I have proposed than the resolution which has been offered by the President of the United States.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution submitted by me as a substitute for the other resolution be referred to the Committees on Foreign Relations and Armed Services, sitting jointly, now considering the problem.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARTIN of Iowa in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### ADJOURNMENT TO TUESDAY

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in accordance with the order previously entered, I now move that the Senate stand in adjournment until Tuesday next at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being, under the order previously entered, until Tuesday, January 29, 1957, at 12 o'clock meridian.

#### NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 25, 1957:

##### DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Christian A. Herter, of Massachusetts, to be Under Secretary of State, vice Herbert Hoover, Jr., resigned.

##### MUNICIPAL COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Catherine B. Kelly, of Maryland, to be associate judge of the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia for a term of 10 years vice Nadine Lane Gallagher, term expired.

#### CONFIRMATION

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 25, 1957:

##### DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Ellsworth Bunker, of Vermont, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to India, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Nepal.

#### WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate January 25, 1957:

##### FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER

William Kelley, of Florida, for promotion to class 3.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

### Small Business and National Security

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 25, 1957

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address I delivered this morning at the Industrial College of the Armed Forces on the subject Small Business and National Security.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### SMALL BUSINESS AND NATIONAL SECURITY

(Address of Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, of Massachusetts, before the Industrial College of the Armed Forces, Washington, D. C., January 25, 1957)

Throughout our Nation's history, small independent business units have been recognized as a basic and indispensable element of our free enterprise system. The inherent strength of our industrial life is a direct result of the freedom of opportunity for every citizen, possessed of the necessary energy and talent, to strike out for himself, to start his own business. While more attention is

given this subject now, we can go back to 1890 to find, in the passage of the Sherman Antitrust Act, legislation designed to preserve the competitive structure of our economy. The question of the position of small business in our economy is neither new nor is it partisan. It is, however, vital.

The interest in small business which has been generated during the past decade has been based on a very real concern that our competitive system is weakening. I would like this morning to point out where these weaknesses have occurred, examine some of the attempts which have been made to help small business and, finally, to suggest to you further steps which should be taken.

#### WHAT IS SMALL BUSINESS?

Let us first delineate the area for discussion—what is small business? There have been many definitions of small business—the Defense Department has one, the Bureau of Internal Revenue has another for its purposes, and the Small Business Administration has still another.

(The Department of Defense considers for procurement purposes that all firms with less than 500 employees, including affiliated, are small. This particular definition originated in the Selective Service Act of 1940 (Public Law 759, 80th Cong.), which stated that a business enterprise would be determined to be small business if (1) its position in the trade or industry was not dominant; (2) the number of employees did not exceed 500; and (3) it was independently owned and operated. I do not believe that under this definition the test of dominance

has ever been made. This particular definition has been used not only by the Department of Defense but by the Atomic Energy Commission, the General Services Administration, and other civilian agencies having a procurement function.)

I am informed that the Bureau of Census considers all manufacturing establishments with less than 100 employees as small, while the size of distributing firms is determined by volume of sales.

The Bureau of Internal Revenue in its statistics on income separates the small from the large at the figure of \$250,000 of total assets.

The Small Business Administration, in its financial assistance program, considers manufacturing concerns as small in relation to their position within the industry. This has been translated into employment figures so that in some industries a small firm would have less than 250 employees and in others less than 1,000 employees. A small retailer is one which has annual sales of \$1 million or less, while a small wholesaler is one which has less than \$5 million in annual sales.)

Only this month the Small Business Administration in cooperation with military and civilian procurement agencies promulgated a new definition for procurement purposes. This definition provides that all concerns with under 500 employees can certify that they are small. Firms with more than 500 employees may apply for a certificate to the effect that they are small and, on protest a firm with less than 500 employees may even be declared not to be small business.